

Campus Crusade for Christ Library



DAVID R. DUNGAN.

ON THE ROCK;

OR

TRUTH STRANGER THAN FICTION

A STORY OF SOULS WHOSE PATHWAY BEGAN IN DARKNESS, BUT BRIGHTENED TO THE PERFECT DAY. ✻ By D. R. DUNGAN.

Thirty-third Edition.



THE STANDARD PUBLISHING CO.,
PUBLISHERS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE. ✻✻ CINCINNATI, O. ✻✻ 1900.

ON THE ROCK

TRUTH STRANGER THAN FICTION
A STORY OF REALS WHICH MAY BE
CAN BE DARKER BUT NOT DARKER TO
THE FUTURE DAY & NIGHT

THE END

Copyright, 1872, by
CALL, BRISTOL & Co.

Copyright renewed, 1900, by
D. R. DUNGAN.

THE STANDARD PUBLISHING CO.
PUBLISHERS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE
100 N. CHICAGO ST. CHICAGO, ILL.

BV

4930

2116

1872

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE.
Cogitations of Our Hero.....	1

CHAPTER II.

His Failure in New York City—Journeys to Buffalo—Goes into Business—Difficulties of the New Situation—No Letters from Home—Religious Heresy in Wales—Elopement Notice in Cardigan Paper—Evil Surmising and Great Torture of Mind.....	9
---	---

CHAPTER III.

News—Delirious with Jealousy and Rage—Finds that He is Greatly Mistaken in the Matter—Jane has Only Embraced the Heresy—Gives Her Reasons for Religious Change—Report in Cardigan that James is Married in America.....	18
---	----

CHAPTER IV.

Correspondence—Strange Contract—Jane Goes to New York—Written Contract and Marriage—The New Home—Religious Differences, How Gotten Along with—A Year and a Half in Buffalo, and a Baby—James Searches for Infant Baptism and Fails—Sends for Dr. Heynor, Who Reads Mark x. 13, 14—Questions and Conversations, but Infant Not Baptized.....	27
---	----

CHAPTER V.

James Determines to Find Infant Baptism—Visits Dr. Heynor Again—Is Promised the Scriptures Next Day—Drayman Overhears Conversation—Calls Next Day—Dr. H. and Bishop D. Visit James and Wife—Methodist Preacher Calls at Office and Proposes to Convince Mrs. Cuggill.....	39
---	----

CHAPTER VI.

James and Jane are Visited by Rev. Mr. Scott, Methodist Preacher, and Rev. Mr. Conoyer, Baptist Preacher, Who Have an Argument on Infant Baptism.....	50
---	----

10815

CHAPTER VII.

PAGE.

- James and Jane Closely Examine All the Cases of Household Baptism Recorded in the Acts of the Apostles... 60

CHAPTER VIII.

- James Attends Methodist Conference—Hears an Able Sermon by the Elder—Has the Promise of a Visit by Rev. Mr. Scott and the Elder—They Miss Their First Appointment, but Come the Next Day—Rev. Mr. Conoyer and the Elder Have a Conversation on the Main Features of Infant Baptism 66

CHAPTER IX.

- Presiding Elder Makes a Second Visit to the Residence of James Cuggill, where Another Conversation is Had on the Subject of Infant Baptism..... 84

CHAPTER X.

- Communication from Sir John Cuggill—Sale of Property in Buffalo—Return to Wales—A Great Day with All the Friends—James Called on Rev. Dr. Brahn—What the Doctor Knew on Infant Baptism—Advertises in the Paper for a Text of Scripture—Several Responses—Reverie—Uneasiness of Sir John Cuggill—Visits Dr. Brahn, and the Doctor Visits James—The Conclusion So Far..... 89

CHAPTER XI.

- Anxiety of Sir J. Cuggill for the Religious Welfare of His Son—Bishop and His Sermon—Proving the True Church by History—If Churches Differ from the Church in the Days of the Apostles, are They the Same Church?—James Had Been Baptized in Infancy and Then Afterwards Confirmed, but Fails to See the Scriptural Authority for All This—What Dr. Brahn Knew of Infant Baptism—James and Wife Visited by a Presbyterian Minister, Who Offers Them a Religious Home—Thinks Infant Baptism the General Tenure of Scripture, and Promises to Find Authority for Affusion..... 101

CHAPTER XII.

- James' Hopefulness—The Baptist Preacher Called in—The Two Preachers Meet—Indisposed to Controversy—

CONTENTS.

v

	PAGE.
James' Confusion—Authority for Female Communion —Reasons for Baptizing Infants—A Change of Subject Agreed upon, and Further Time Granted in which to Prepare for the Investigation	111
CHAPTER XIII.	
Great Search After Truth—The Meeting Obtains—Heb ix. 10 Referred to, and All the Sprinklings and Bath- ings of the Law of Moses Called Up	119
CHAPTER XIV.	
The Meeting—Confidence in Position—Argument from Ezek. xxxvi. 25 and Isa. lii. 15—Philip and the Eunuch Referred to, with the Usual Argumentation on Both Sides	127
CHAPTER XV.	
The Visit of Friends—Views of Mr. Warwick—Grief of the Father and Mother of Our Hero—The Pledge and the Promise.....	138
CHAPTER XVI.	
The Investigation of the Scriptural Use of Bapto, and the Translation by King James' Translators.....	145
CHAPTER XVII.	
Another Visit from Rev. Mr. McCarron—What the Learned Groves Had to Say About Bapto and Baptizo —How He Would Render Immersion into Greek—The Three Thousand on the Pentecost—How Immerse So Many, and Where Find the Water ?.....	155
CHAPTER XVIII.	
John Baptized in Bethabara beyond Jordan—What Does It Mean ? - Why Did He Baptize at Enon ?—How Bap- tize So Many ?—Matt. iii. 5—Who Were Baptized by John ?—Two Opponents.....	163
CHAPTER XIX.	
Birthday Party—Religion and the Toothache—Many Friends and a Fine Visit—Rev. Mr. Hampton Talks to Jane on the Subject of Religion, and Argues Affusion from the Evident References to Christian Baptism by the Term "Wash"—The View of Sir John Cuggill and Wife on the Conversation.....	172

CHAPTER XX.

PAGE.

Many Persons Become Interested—Philippian Jailer Introduced—Baptized in the Jail or Not? or Why?—Saul of Tarsus—House of Judas—Standing Up—Arise—Pharpar, Abana, or Where?.....	183
---	-----

CHAPTER XXI.

Rev. Mr. McCarron's Difficulties—Sermon on Baptism—Great Interest in the Investigation—Mrs. Jane Cuggill—Rom. vi. 3, 4—Col. ii. 12—Figurative? Spiritual? Continuous? Moral? or What?—Holy Spirit Baptism (Joel ii. 28-31; Acts ii. and x.)—Israelites Crossing the Sea	192
---	-----

CHAPTER XXII.

The Inquiry—Passage Through the Sea—The Cloud a Pillar—Did it Rain?—Baptism an Emblem of Purification; of the Death of Christ and His Resurrection—Meaning of I. Cor. xv. 30, etc.—Baptized for the Dead—If Sprinkling Thought to Be Right, is It Right?.....	211
---	-----

CHAPTER XXIII.

James' Sleeplessness and Final Determination—Great Interest in the Baptism—The Scenie—James Demands Baptism, and is Refused—Great Excitement—Cloud, Satisfaction—Dining at Sir George Freeman's—Rev. Mr. Bonner—Regeneration, Born of Water—Hereditary Total Depravity—Whom the Baptist Church Receives.	218
---	-----

CHAPTER XXIV.

James and Jane Discuss the Former's Troubles—James' Opinion of the Baptist Church—The Protracted Meeting—Experience-telling—James' Father and Mother Join the Baptists—What James Thinks of It—He is Visited by Many Friends, and Finally by Rev. Mr. Bonner	229
--	-----

CHAPTER XXV.

The Meeting—Finding Peace—Objections to Baptism for Remission—Third Party—Can't Believe It—Scripture Teaching—Regeneration Before Faith and Repentance—Consequence—How of Infant Regeneration?—No Man Can Come to Christ except Drawn of the Father—Except It were Given of God—How Given?—Believe Not Because Not of My Sheep—Meaning of Sheep and the Passage.....	240
--	-----

CONTENTS.

vii

CHAPTER XXVI.

	PAGE.
James Visits the Meeting Then in Progress—Is Prayed for—Is Exhorted, and Finally Speaks, to the Dissatisfaction of Some—Is Visited Again by Rev. B., Who Brings Forward the Scriptures to Prove that Saving Faith is a Direct Gift of God, without the Employment of Human Instrumentality.....	253

CHAPTER XXVII.

James Has Another Visit by Rev. B., Who Essays to Prove that Faith Does Not Come Through Any Human Instrumentality; that Repentance Precedes Faith in the Gospel Order; that Repentance is a Direct Gift—Tries the Doctrine of Hereditary Depravity Once More	262
---	-----

CHAPTER XXVIII.

How Depraved?—What the Result of Adam's Sin—What Need of Atonement?—What is the Atonement?—Salvation by Works, or Faith Only?—Neither—Paul to the Romans, and James Compared.....	271
---	-----

CHAPTER XXIX.

A Good Meeting—Bright Experiences—Need of Prayer—Cornelius and Saul Prayed—A Peter Wanted—Evidence of Pardon—Feeling or Faith—Which the Source of Happiness—How Appropriate God's Promises—Baptism of John—What For—The Commission, Etc. .	281
--	-----

CHAPTER XXX.

Attending the Meeting—Rev. Mr. Melroy—The Sermon—The Mourners—Jane Speaks to the Mourners—Interruption—Reads Again—A Song—An Experience—Another Effort for Seekers—Dismissed—Praise and Blame—Protracted Meeting Ended—Preachers Going to See James Cuggill—His Father's Opinion.....	291
---	-----

CHAPTER XXXI.

The Two Ministers Censure Mrs. Cuggill—Her Defense—Scripture Exegesis—Acts ii. 38 ; xxii. 16 ; x. 44-48—Regeneration—Simon the Magician—Paul Not Sent to Baptize—The Twelve Disciples at Ephesus—The Great Excitement and Determination for the Next Day.....	299
---	-----

CHAPTER XXXII.

PAGE.

Great Excitement—Wonderful Stories—Harsh Measures Proposed—Radicalism, or Conservatism?—Ill-directed Rage—All Go to the Baptist Church—Can Any Christian Baptize?—Wait for Covenant Meeting—Great Change! Just Want to Be Christians!—The Proposition Accepted - Committee Appointed.....	322
---	-----

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Meeting and Work of the Committee—Charity Necessary to Unity—Are Creeds in the Way of Union?—Is the Word of God a Sufficient Rule?—Is the Name "Baptist" a Proper Name for Any and Every Discip'le?—It is in the Scripture—So is Pharisee—Close Communion—The Lord's Supper—Church Officers—Final Perseverance—Unconditional Election—Experience-telling—Operation of the Spirit—No Delay in Baptizing—Sharp Controversy—Articles Adopted, and Some Thirty Persons are Baptized.....	331
--	-----

PREFACE.

The literary activity that was noted by the wise king as a feature of his own times, is, to no less extent, a characteristic of ours. Of making books there seems to be no end. The vast accumulations, gathered every year at the office of the Librarian of Congress, show that a *mania scribendi* has fallen upon our age. There is such a deluge of literature, bad and good, silly and sensible, doomed to molder upon the booksellers' shelves, or to meet with the rare fortune of being read, that there is little excuse for asking the public to notice the birth of a new volume, unless it either makes some new contribution to the knowledge of the world, or makes an old story new, by telling it in a new way.

This volume discusses no new theme, nor does it present novel ideas upon the old theme of Christianity. Its novelty is found in protesting against novelties in religion, and insisting upon the usages of the primitive church. It does not claim to traverse a field never occupied before. Great and sound men have discussed the questions that it attempts to solve, but they have addressed themselves to the critical mind. The great Teacher

spoke for the *people*, not for the doctors—and “the common people heard him gladly.” This volume adopts a method for the discussion of salvation from sin, the subject, mode and object of baptism, which is, it is hoped, adapted to popular education on the religious issues of the day.

It was written for the benefit of, and is dedicated to, the *people*, with the prayer and hope that it will be widely read and that it will do them good. The author has carefully avoided technical expressions and obscure phrases, in order that it might meet their wants. He has endeavored to take these questions from the exclusive hands of the theologians, and to place them in the hands of the people for their own adjudication. Will they, like the Bereans, examine the Scriptures, to see whether these things be so?

B. W. J.

ON THE ROCK.

CHAPTER I.

COGITATIONS OF OUR HERO.

The sun shone with as much luster and beauty as though no fog had ever been seen in South Wales. So thought James Cuggill, one bright morning in April, as he stood on the front porch of his father's palatial residence, near the city of Cardigan, gazing upon the combined beauties of nature and art. The family were all enjoying a morning sleep but James, whose good health, energetic nature and industrious habits would not allow him to remain indoors long in the morning, unless the fog was unusually thick. That morning all was clear, the air was quite transparent, and the sun was doing his best to light up both hamlet and country. The soft, mellow light was thrown back by even the tiling on the houses of Cardigan, as if they felt conscious of having glory enough for one day, without being further caressed by the King of day.

Tenants and gardeners were all astir, servants were up and engaging in the daily round of duties,

while only the rich slept after the sun had greeted the earth with his morning smiles. The poor were going to their tasks, with songs of good will and good nature, after a little bitters—"for good cheer, and to cut the fog in the morning," if "Dick" had not been seen by any member of the family the night previous. A little something to strengthen the stomach was, at that time, regarded a good thing in a family, whether they had fog or not. With a fog it was absolutely necessary, but at any time it was a "creature of God," and not to be refused. The morning of which we speak was well calculated to inspire the heart with courage and hope; and it is not strange that our young hero should have had bright visions of a golden future in a far-off land.

For about two years James had been contemplating, at least, a tour to America. He had read and heard so much about this western Canaan, that he longed to see it. He had at different times spoken of his desire to his parents, only to be discouraged by them from such an undertaking. His father was one of the wealthy lords of the land, and one who stood high in his country as a gentleman of honor, and that his son should now be contemplating, not only a tour to America, but also to make his home, *if all things might be agreeable*, in the land of Washington, would seem to be madness in the eye of every one but James Cuggill. To him it appeared a great want of manly independence to fall into the estate of his sires and be rich and respectable, not from any

good qualities or worth of his own, but simply because he had been born into this respectability. Strange as it may seem, he had even wished that he had been born poor, that he might have had the honor of working his way through the world. And now that he was nearly twenty-two years of age, it was time that he would choose for himself a line of life, that he would fix before his mind a beau ideal of man, and determine upon that object to which his energies should be bent. Having a kind of natural horror at the idea of falling into the stagnant greatness and nobility of the country and the age, just on account of the wealth of his father, and the fact that he was his only son and only heir, he formed his purpose and fixed his determination to try his fortune in the New World.

This determination was not the impulse of a moment. It was the result of much meditation and thought. He had not failed, as too many frequently do, to consider the amount of sacrifice and privation, toil and even suffering, that would be connected with the new enterprise. He had counted these item by item, and had considered well upon what he must undergo to reach the desired goal.

He would have to separate from his parents, who, if they had ever been unkind to him, it was in being too indulgent. This was a painful thought, and the more so as they were both advanced in years, and if he should go to America he might never see them again. And when he took into account the affection they had for him,

and the pain that it would give them, his courage nearly gave way; but then he thought that he might encourage them with the idea that he would soon return. So he tided over his first difficulty.

To leave friends and home, the scenes of his early childhood and the joy of his maturer years, to leave the parish school and the parish church, with all their fond associations of the past, came in, as we may be sure, for their portion of serious contemplation. He was a High Churchman, as all his people were members of that body; and though he had never been very devoted in religion, yet he had always been present at the services of the church, and was always well pleased with the imposing ritualism, and he felt that he ought to counsel with the rector of the parish in a matter of such importance as this; for perhaps a kinder, truer man could not have been found among all the parish rectors in Wales than the Rev. Mr. Brahn. Under his ministration our young friend had received his religious education and had been admitted to the communion. To leave the parish school would not seem to be hard, for he had already passed beyond its precincts, but somehow it had its attractions. Even the correction-room, where he had been flogged for not remembering the text of the sermon on the Sunday previous, or the "three heads of the discourse," that the older boys were required to remember, or the leading thought of the sermon, that the more advanced scholars were expected to relate on Monday morn-

ings, was dear to his heart. All these were considered by James that morning as he stood gazing upon the scenery before him. One after another of these items had been taken up and discussed in his mind, in a manner and with an ability that would have done credit to a philosopher.

But another item in this calculation was not so readily discussed, nor so easily disposed of: What would Jane Freeman think of all this? George Freeman, her father, was a wealthy lord, and lived only about two miles from the residence of Sir John Cuggill, the father of our young friend. Jane was an only daughter, though she had two brothers—one older, and the other younger, than herself. Jane was then about nineteen, and was as beautiful a maiden as might be found in Wales. She was not a belle, as we speak of flirts and coquettes, but a sober, sensible, pious girl. She had been educated as James had been; she had, for several years, been admitted to the communion of the same church. The Freemans were all members of the Episcopalian Church, though, perhaps, they cared less for the ceremony and gorgeous ritualism than most persons of wealth did.

James Cuggill and Jane Freeman had almost been reared together. They had always been very fond of each other's society. They had long experienced for each other that wonderful something called "love." And already they had agreed to unite their fortunes. But the time of such union was not yet determined. Hence we may be sure that the thought of leaving Jane Freeman behind

sent our hero into a brown study, and a reverie from which he did not recover till he was summoned by the servant to come in for the morning prayers.

At breakfast James seemed very reticent, and even appeared sad. At last his father, who always was of a cheerful disposition and delighted to see every one happy around him, inquired of his son for the cause of his silence; to which James replied in brief, but gave an outline of his determinations. Of course, his father and mother were greatly surprised. They did all in their power to dissuade him from his proposed adventure, but to no purpose. He was fully determined.

Finally his parents agreed to let him go, after he had assured them that he would return in two years. And, if all things else were agreeable, he would start in about a week for Liverpool, en route for New York City.

Now, feeling that his parents were reconciled to his departure, James next wended his way to the residence of Sir George Freeman, that he might talk the matter over with Jane. But, to leave the detail of the sad intelligence that was that morning furnished to the loving, trusting heart of Jane, suffice it to say that they talked, and sighed and wept, as only true lovers can at the thought of such a parting. And it was finally agreed that their nuptials should be celebrated in two years, when James should return to remain in the land of his nativity, or take the newly married bride to the fairy-land beyond the Atlantic.

Time flew by and brought the day of departure, with all its tears and regrets and sorrows, too deep to be spoken. But from one after another, James took the leave of all his numerous friends, the parish rector and his family included, till the farewell had been exchanged all around and the benediction had been pronounced.

It is needless to follow our young hero through his tedious journey. Then the Atlantic was only crossed by sail-vessels, and it was not until about the first of June that he was permitted to put his feet upon the soil of America. He had many times wished himself at home, or dead, or anywhere, rather than on the boundless ocean, seasick. But now, as he passed up into the great American city, and saw the whirl and stir of business, and witnessed the active energy of the American people, he felt very happy at the prospects of real life that loomed up before him.

He had written home when he was in Liverpool, and now a long letter would be due as soon as he would be able to "take in his situation," and understand the arrangements of this Yankee land more perfectly.

A few days were devoted to looking through the city and "learning the fashions," and then he wrote to his friends as full an account of his journey, and of the people and customs of New York City, as he could. Of course, Jane was furnished with a separate communication from New York, as she had been from Liverpool; for Jane and home were so nearly identical that he could

scarcely think of one without the other. Especially, he was unable to think of home without thinking of Jane.

How Jane employed her time for these weary days and weeks, we have no means of knowing, but presume to say that she was interested in no small degree in all news that might be obtained in the quiet city of Cardigan that would, in any way, relate to the ship that took James to America.

CHAPTER II.

HIS FAILURE IN NEW YORK CITY—JOURNEYS TO BUFFALO—GOES INTO BUSINESS—DIFFICULTIES OF THE NEW SITUATION—NO LETTERS FROM HOME—RELIGIOUS HERESY IN WALES — ELOPEMENT NOTICE IN CARDIGAN PAPER — EVIL SURMISING, AND GREAT TORTURE OF MIND.

Now that James was in New York City, the great business metropolis of the United States, he had a fine opportunity to learn the style and business habits of the American people. Everything in this New World contrasted very strikingly, in his estimation, with the arrangements of the cities of England and Wales. He soon realized that he was in the land of fast horses and fast men, vegetables and large oysters.

With many of the changes he was not well pleased, but with most of them he was. It would be too much to expect him to be pleased with everything in which our country differed from the land of his nativity. Indeed, Europeans are apt to be completely disgusted with the customs of the American people, because they differ widely from those that they have honored from their very childhood. But James Cuggill was a liberal-minded young man, and could see defects in the stereotyped arrangements of the Old World, and was prepared to do justice to the customs of our people.

A whole week was taken up in viewing the "great city." Every man seemed busier than another, and more intent on minding his own business. But all alike were striving with one heart and one soul to get money. At the end of the week James thought that New York would be all the same without him, and, as he could find no one that could appreciate the ability and see the absolute necessity of a scholarly young Welshman, he was disposed to look elsewhere for a place to employ the thousand pounds that he had brought with him as a beginning capital, from which he expected, of course, to make an immense fortune.

On Monday morning he left for Buffalo, where he imagined his ability and money would be more in demand.

The journey was completed without any accident worthy of mention. And though we have improved very greatly in our mode of travel since that time, yet he realized that we were so far in advance of Great Britain with respect to speed, that he was quite happy to witness this evidence of American progress.

Buffalo was found to be as stirring a place as New York. But there were not so many people, and capital seemed more in demand.

A few days more were spent in a kind of reconnoitering of the city, before he thought of trying for business. He had determined to be cautious. For even his friends had predicted that his means would not last him long; that he would soon find the bottom of his purse and be glad to return to

Cardigan, antediluvian as he had thought its customs to be. Well, he was determined to show them that it was not rashness, but real, genuine, manly courage, that had brought him to America.

Finding an opportunity to invest his means in a foundry and machine-shop, and become one of the firm, in a way that promised well, he went into business.

A great many things he had to learn. One was, to properly respect American genius and American progress. Indeed, it was not until, at different times, he had nearly involved himself in serious difficulty that he finally came to understand the difference between Johnny Bulls and Young Jonathans. He found that he had to address servants in this country in a respectful manner, and that they would no more stand harsh treatment than their masters. But at last he came to understand and appreciate American independence, and the leveling tendency of our institutions, that place all men on an equality, save as some may be really more meritorious than others. This and other important lessons of a kindred nature having been learned, James began to feel very comfortable in his new home and new situation. He found that his business was not only pleasant, but very profitable; and he began to realize the pleasure of making money by a careful management of his own affairs.

A whole year had been spent in America, and he was quite well at home. Trade was always brisk, and everything seemed to go well with him.

He had not discontinued his correspondence, but had written about two letters per week to Cardigan—one to his parents, and the other to Jane Freeman—and he had received from his friends about the same number in return. He had not become homesick, but still he would have liked to be at Cardigan again, not only to see father and mother, but to see one that was dearer to him than parents. He had seen many beautiful belles in Buffalo that would readily have accepted an offer to become a life partner with James Cuggill, but he could not harbor the thought of being untrue to his “Jennie.”

But somehow, for a few weeks past, he had not received any communications by way of letter. A paper printed in Cardigan continued its regular visits to him; and, failing to get any other news from home, he would read carefully every word in the paper, that he might, if possible, learn why his friends had all at once ceased to communicate with him. Were they sick? Surely the paper would take some notice of it, for the Cuggills and Freemans were among the nobility, and would have at least newspaper sympathy in any misfortune that might befall them.

He saw in the paper but little home news, except the usual round of fortune and misfortune that visits all mankind. A few deaths, a few marriages among his acquaintances, now and then a fire, etc. But in one of his papers he had noticed the breaking out of a new religion, with which the people were being carried away. The paper,

though secular, was very severe in its denunciation of what it denominated the "new heresy." Many of the common people heard the new doctrine gladly, and became advocates of its claims. Also a few in the higher walks of human life, even among the more wealthy, had believed in this new religion, and hence had left the High Church. Those advocating the new doctrine were called "Baptists," and sometimes, contemptuously, "dippers," "plungers," etc. They were regarded as an "illiterate set of semimaniacs" that had become restive and insubordinate, and therefore were trying "to turn the world upside down." Several columns in the paper were taken up in exposing these new-fangled notions and berating these heretics. They were accused of teaching almost all kinds of doctrine, and having among them all sorts of men. Indeed, some of them had already been imprisoned as disturbers of the peace.

How any one could become so disquieted on the subject of religion who had an honorable connection with the High Church—"the only apostolic church of Christ"—was something that our hero was not quite able to fathom. For his part, he had never given it a moment's thought. He had been reared in the strictest manner, and had never in his life attended any other meetings but those of "his own church." Since he had been in Buffalo he had attended the services of Rev. Dr. Heynor, and rejoiced that the ritualism of the "Holy Church" is the same everywhere. He had seen many other churches in Buffalo, and witnessed

that many people attended them, but it had never entered his mind that they could be anything but a set of deceived fanatics. Hence, simply to excite wonder in his mind, and perhaps a little regret that any of his acquaintances had been deceived by the new heresy, was about all the effect that the religious news had upon him.

But in one paper he saw something that more profoundly astonished and puzzled him. In reading down one of the columns on the inside of his paper from Cardigan, he came upon this:

“Great excitement prevailed here yesterday on account of an elopement.” And here James thought that new things might occur even in Wales. Some fellow is ruined by losing his sweetheart or his wife. “Well,” said he, almost audibly, “I am glad that I am not the sufferer.” But, of course, he had to read the rest of it. He wanted to know who the truants were. “It appears”—reading on—“that for some time past there has been going on a secret courtship between a Mr. Henderson, of Hereford, England, and a young lady living near this place, whose name, on account of her family relations, we suppress. Very early yesterday morning the couple went to Rev. Dr. McClaren’s and asked to be married. But the reverend gentleman recognized the lady that she belonged to the parish of Rev. Dr. Brahn, and hence refused to perform the ceremony, suggesting, at the same time, that they would return to the parish in which the lady resided. They promised to do so, and left. Later in the day a couple were seen going on board

of a French vessel lying at the dock that in every way answered their description. The vessel soon after sailed for Havre, France. If these were the runaways, it is not known at this writing whether they were married at the time of leaving or not; and, as no trace has been found of the young couple, the parents and friends of the young lady are in deep distress. This calamity is further augmented by the fact that she had been promised to another."

At first James thought but little about it. Though such things were not very frequent in Wales, he had become quite accustomed to such reports in Buffalo. But after ruminating the contents of that elopement card in his mind, something seemed to whisper to him: "It may be that there is something in this that will account for the fact of your having received no letter from Cardigan lately." James staggered and grew dizzy at the first flash of such an idea. If another had intimated the possible inconstancy, he would have met a rebuke as forcible as elegant, to say the least of it. What! Jane Freeman elope with an Englishman to France! Too preposterous to be entertained for a moment. But why did he get no letter? And then, looking over the notice again, he said to himself: "If Jane Freeman had run off with another man, the editor would have put in just such a notice as he did, and of course they would not write to me, and my parents would feel too mortified to write to me—for they know of my engagement to her." Hence, on the supposi-

tion that his Jane had played truant, all the facts, so far as he knew, would be entirely accounted for. "But Jane never received the attention of any one else than myself. And if she had been keeping company with any young man since I left, my mother, at any rate, would have let me know all about it." But, looking over the notice for the fourth time, he sees that it says: "It seems that a secret courtship," etc. So, perhaps, for all that, neither his parents nor her parents would know anything about it. And then he had some faint recollection of meeting some young Englishman, from Bath, or Hereford, or some other place, at Mr. Freeman's about two years before that. Yes, he now recollects distinctly all about it. He had formerly been acquainted with the Freemans, and came with some of their relatives on a visit. But whether his name was Henderson he had entirely forgotten, but it seemed as though that was the name! It had a son to it, and why not Henderson? Now he could remember the very appearance of the man—height, complexion, manner, etc. But how ridiculous all this cogitation! Jane Freeman would never marry such a looking man, if he was the last one! Tall, thin, red hair, purse-mouth! Humph! How silly to bring him up in his mind. But then, women do sometimes fall in love with very inferior-looking men, especially if they have red hair, and play the dandy.

James had no real thought of the unfaithfulness of his "Jennie," but, for some cause, he had not received a letter from her for several weeks, and he

was disposed to surmise some evil thing about her. And when a lover gets into an evil train of thought, how wonderfully everything seems to harmonize with the dark picture. He could now see a hundred circumstances in his life and in the history of the Freemans that would indicate that, after all, Jane may never have really loved him, and had taken this opportunity to get rid of him.

It was late that night before James retired for rest, and even then he was unable to take sleep. But at last weariness overcame him, and he slept till late in the morning. He rose in the morning but to renew his evil thoughts of the previous night, and make himself as miserable as possible.

Poor James! tidings had come for him, and were waiting in the post-office—tidings that would change the manner of his thought, but would do little toward lifting the burden from his heart.

CHAPTER III.

NEWS—DELIRIOUS WITH JEALOUSY AND RAGE—FINDS THAT HE IS GREATLY MISTAKEN IN THE MATTER—JANE HAS ONLY EMBRACED THE HERESY—GIVES HER REASONS FOR RELIGIOUS CHANGE—REPORT IN CARDIGAN THAT JAMES IS MARRIED IN AMERICA.

James Cuggill has been to the post-office and received a very large letter. The writing on the back seemed like the handwriting of his father. It was too long a communication to read in the office, hence he returned to his own room before he unsealed the document.

We may be sure that James did not idle away his time, but returned to his room by the shortest route, and by the quickest possible movement. At last, having assured himself that he was alone, and that no intruder might interrupt him while reading the long-looked-for epistle, with a trembling hand he removed the wrapper. Hope and fear seemed to be at war in his breast, and, for the present, the contest was evenly balanced. And now, as he was unfolding the manuscript that would furnish him with the desired intelligence, he was agitated in no slight degree; he could think only of Jane, and that suspicion-exciting note in the Cardigan paper.

On opening the letter, he saw that it was from his father, and contained some twelve pages of large-size letter paper, closely written. It was

large enough to contain his father's will; but the letter began by assuring him of the good health of his parents.

He could not read it quick enough, and hence turned the pages, one after another, as though he expected their intelligence in some mysterious way to enter into his mind. He looked at the beginning of each paragraph to see if he could account for this long delay in writing, and why he had received nothing yet from Jane. He soon saw what confirmed his fears of the very worst.

He saw in one of the paragraphs the name "Freeman," and he fairly trembled for fear of the sad news that might follow. He stopped his wandering over the letter to read what he now felt sure would unlock the mystery, and read these words: "The Freemans are disgraced in the eyes of all respectable people. Jane is lost to you forever!"

This was enough—his worst fears were now confirmed. "Jane Freeman," said he, in a kind of half-audible voice, "has been unfaithful; she is the 'runaway'; deserted friends and home; gone to France with that red-haired, long-jointed Englishman." He threw down the epistle and strode around the room like a madman, murmuring, "Jane is lost to you forever!" and every time he uttered it, he seemed to realize more than ever the terrible force and awful meaning of those words. "To be beaten in a fair effort to make love by an honorable opponent would be bearable, but to have this creature"—and then he applied adjectives to his imaginary rival till the evil side of his

vocabulary was exhausted—"succeed in getting my 'Jennie' is too much." But all this brought him no comfort; rather, it increased his pain. His brain fairly whirled. His head was dizzy. His very features were distorted, exhibiting the work of grief and rage. Had he stayed in Wales, Jane might have been his own dear wife, and this terrible torture for life might never have befallen him. Again he thought if Jane had been so thoughtless, and proved so recreant, he was well rid of her. But his philosophy soon forsook him, and he approximated more nearly to insanity than before. It was well for him that he had not read the death-seeking, lover-poisoning novels of our time, or he would surely have ended his earthly career.

But, after worrying himself sufficiently with his evil cogitations, he thought he might as well have the rest of the news. Whatever else the letter might contain, it could not contain anything worse than what he had already read. And now, determined to bear up under anything that it might contain like a philosopher, and read with stoical indifference the whole account of his own ruin, he returned to his stand, seated himself, and took up the letter to read. And just preceding the paragraph that had made him almost delirious, he read: "The Freemans have all embraced the heresy, Jane along with the rest, and were all plunged in water by the hands of the unlearned innovator."

But what could such language as this mean? This "plunging" was a new business, and he could not divine what it meant. It could not be possible

that Jane's father and mother and brothers would uphold her in eloping with an Englishman to France. "They have all embraced the heresy," "plunged in water," etc., must refer to some new religion, by which, through some artifice of the wicked one, they had been betrayed. His heart was a little frightened. They might be undeceived, if it were only a religious deception, and all things become as they were. But now he had found that he must read the entire epistle in its order, or not understand it. So he began with the first, and read it to the last.

He felt very greatly relieved to find that all his evil thoughts of Jane's inconstancy were creatures of his imagination. And yet, in the estimation of his father, her sin was scarcely less than that which James had imagined. She, with her father, mother, two brothers, and a number of friends and relatives, had joined the Baptists—for they had been filling Wales with their doctrine. Remarking upon this, the father says: "I have refrained from writing, hoping to be able, before this time, to record the exit of these innovators and the funeral of the new heresy. But in this I have been disappointed. Like a raging fire, it defies all efforts to check it; and, like an epidemic, it has covered the land, and entered almost every household, and destroyed the best members of many families.

"All has been done by our beloved rector that has been in his power to hold in check this spiritual malady; but to no purpose. He gave several timely discourses on the history of the church that

would seem to be enough to satisfy any, but the determinedly disobedient that the church of Henry and James is none other than the church of Christ. He also visited from house to house, and had many others engaged in like holy work, beseeching all the communicants of 'St. Bartholomew's' to give no more heed to this iniquitous scheme to draw away church-members from the communion of the 'Holy Mother Church.' They listened to his sermons, heard his warnings, and then, as though Satan had them entirely, continued to drink in the new doctrine, and finally to heed it as the great voice of God.

"But what astonishes and grieves me most of all, is that the Freemans went off in the excitement; and, despite the entreaties of all friends, went and were dipped into this new religion. Knowing your love for Jane, I went in person to see her, and to try to keep her from being ruined by this heresy. And—would you believe it?—I found her reading the Bible, and ready to speak of its contents as though she had been divinely called to the ministry. I knew this to be one of the first symptoms of the terrible malady. They first begin to read the Scriptures, then you hear of them being dipped into the Baptist Church.

"And when I found Jane in the same state of mind with others that had already been led away, I told her very plainly that if she had no respect for her friends or her religion, and was disposed to disgrace the church of Christ, by leaving it to follow the whims of madmen, that, at least, she should

regard her contract with you ; for I knew that you would be indignant at such an action, and leave her to the comfort of her new religion. Poor creature, she wept bitterly at what I told her. And it was a long time before she spoke again. But finally, as if Satan had taken possession of her to complete his work of deception, she said that her first duty was to obey 'her Saviour,' but that she did not think you would blame her for doing that which she thought to be her duty. I confess that I was in a rage, and said angry words. For in my heart I wished all these fanatical church disturbers, and all their deluded followers, hopelessly lost in hell."

No doubt Mr. Cuggill told the truth with respect to his hatred to the Baptists, for he was exceedingly mad against them. We might give many other quotations from his lengthy epistle, but we have given enough to show the hatred that he had for the "innovators." Nearly the whole letter was taken up with the "Baptists" and the "Free-mans." He was determined to destroy the happiness of Jane by preventing the match with his son. It was easy to see that this was the burden of his letter.

Fathers very frequently overreach the mark, and destroy their own power when they begin to give advice to their sons. They should never cross the son's affections except with the soundest reason and the finest display of paternal sympathy and love.

But, with all James' love for his father, he was almost disgusted with the threats employed by his

father to prevent him from ever carrying on any further correspondence with Jane Freeman. One of these threats was, that if he did violate this command of his father, he should be disowned, and hence would fail to get the fortune that would come to him from his parents.

With almost any one else, such a threat would have had more potency than with James Cuggill. He was not made of that kind of stuff. He prided himself in his ability to take care of himself. And to be dispossessed and disowned for less than sufficient reasons, exhibited a want of natural affection that he was not prepared to understand.

But then, aside from his father's threats, there was a serious question in his mind: That if Jane had become so fickle-minded as to be so easily led away into some new religion, was she really worthy of him? For he regarded it fickleness or weakness that would allow any one, brought up in "the only true religion," to be led away by these "illiterate babblers," as his father and the paper in Cardigan called these Baptist preachers. But this question would not do. It might have done as the ground of a little love quarrel, had he been where Jane was, but, knowing that Jane was one of the most sensible and modest girls in Wales, the question of her mental worth was no longer entertained. But why had she not advised with him in such a matter as this? And, especially, why had she not written to him at all for a long time?

He finally thought that, if Jane would be true to him, he would send for her to come to America.

at once. He then would not encounter the wrath of his father. And separating Jane from her new Baptist associations, she would finally return to the "true and holy church."

Next morning the mail was brought to his room. Four letters from Cardigan, via Liverpool, written by the same hand. It was the writing of "Jennie." Never did James Cuggill trace more carefully, or study the import of each word more thoroughly, than on the reading of these letters. First, second, third, fourth, he read them in their order, until the last line and the last word of the last letter had been read.

In all these Jane was true to herself. Hence they were full of good sense and genuine affection. We make a single quotation from one of them, giving her reasons for her religious change. She says:

"You know, dear James, that I have long thought that High Churchmen were more delighted with the mere ceremonies of religion according to the requirements of the church than in any obedience from the heart rendered to Christ. And, further, you will recollect that you and I had once a conversation on baptism. And we were not able to tell why our church sprinkled water upon the face or head, when our professor in Greek told us that the Greek word *baptizo* meant to dip or immerse. Now I have come to the conclusion that many of the practices of the High Church are not authorized in the Scriptures, and that it is better to obey God than man. I regret that I have not the privilege of counseling with you in this matter, except by let-

ter; and, on account of the tediousness of such correspondence, I have concluded not to further delay my obedience to Christ."

To James it was almost sin against the Holy Spirit to speak a word against the church of his sires. And this was the only item in Jane's communication that was in any way offensive to him.

But poor Jane was suffering no little mental agony just then. Sir John Cuggill, the father of our hero, feeling confident of his power over his son, had hinted that James would marry in America and pay no further attention to Jane Freeman. And from that confidential hint the story became current that he was already married.

CHAPTER IV.

CORRESPONDENCE—STRANGE CONTRACT--JANE GOES TO NEW YORK—WRITTEN CONTRACT AND MARRIAGE—THE NEW HOME—RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCES, HOW GOTTEN ALONG WITH—A YEAR AND A HALF IN BUFFALO, AND A BABY—JAMES SEARCHES FOR INFANT BAPTISM AND FAILS—SENDS FOR DR. HEYNOR, WHO READS MARK X. 13, 14—QUESTIONS AND CONVERSATIONS, BUT INFANT NOT BAPTIZED.

Jane knew that the rage of Sir John Cuggill would cause him to use his utmost endeavors to have his prediction fulfilled. But her confiding, trusting heart could scarcely believe that a father's threats could make James unfaithful to her. And yet, with the anxiety of love, she awaited further intelligence. But a letter finally from James settled this question. I here take the liberty of quoting from the letter, remarking, however, beforehand that James Cuggill was sensible to a degree that many are not at the present time, and that his good sense was clearly indicated in dealing with practical questions in a practical way. Mock modesty prevents many young people from acting thus wisely. But here is the quotation :

“ You must be aware that your having left the church is to me a great source of grief. I have not the slightest reason to question your motives or doubt your sincerity. And, however improper I regard such a change, I do not esteem you less for having done what you have in this matter. [The

truth is, no man of sense ever esteemed any woman less for being conscientious in religious matters.] But there are some things that I think it proper to say to you; things in which you have a common interest with myself. The time that I was to take you to be mine for life is sufficiently near at hand to discuss, with some degree of freeness, the proprieties and improprieties of the proposed alliance. If, in the matrimonial alliance, God should grant to us a family, shall they be brought up to respect what I regard as the only true church, or trained up in your new idea of religious matters? To me this is a question of very great importance. In your present religious situation, it would be perfectly natural for you to exert your influence in favor of what you call 'The Baptist Church.' But this would be a source of lasting grief to me. I have often wished myself as devoted in religious matters as you. I am aware that your gentle nature and devoted, benevolent heart would be an irresistible power over a young family. And if your religious views are to be perpetuated by you, and made the source of bitterness, dear as you are to me, I must say that it would be better for us not to be united in marriage relations. To say this is like taking my life-blood, but I must be true to the religion of my fathers. May I not expect, therefore, that now, having answered your conscience in, as you think, obeying the Saviour, you will return to the *holy apostolic church*? And when I shall bring you to my home to be my dear wife, I to be the 'happiest man,' shall my

bliss not be confirmed by your return to the communion of the same church with me?"

James could hardly say less than what he did, after assuring his father that he need have no fear; that he would have Jane back in the High Church again. He had been assured in Jane's last letter of her very great love for him, and hence he thought that, by a judicious course, he could bring her back again.

Jane Freeman was tried no little by this letter. She knew that James was in earnest in the matter, and meant no less than what he said. Hence, "Must I lay aside my religion, or be deprived of the man I love?" was the question! Something seemed to say to her, "Has he not been fair? And, after all the efforts of his nearest friends to set him against you, has he not exhibited a noble and manly spirit? This is a small thing that he asks of you, anyway. Now that you have secured your salvation, you can live with him in the Episcopal Church quite well. And for all the good you can accomplish by an obstinate course, it will hardly equal the sadness that will come to you on account of it. Besides, you may have more influence over him by being with him in the same church. And by yielding to him now, he will be compelled, by his generous nature, to yield to you after awhile."

Whatever this was that whispered these things to Jane, she waited till she could have ample time to test the correctness of the philosophy in her mind. Hence she read the letter once a day for three or

four days in succession, before she attempted to answer it.

Finally, after much meditation and prayerful thought, she sent the following reply to that part of James' letter that related to religion:

"DEAR JAMES:—No one can feel more keenly than I do the want of a unity of religious sentiment and opinion between us. But you must realize that I have the same right to ask you to deny yourself of the pleasure of your own religious convictions, or to leave your church and join the Baptists with me, that you have to make a like demand of me. I should, however, not think of asking such a thing of you. You may not, therefore, expect that I will leave the Baptist Church and return to the Episcopal Church. I say this in full view of the possibility of its keeping us separate for life, and yet, if I were to choose between death and a separation from you during life, I would choose the former. And I feel now, as I am writing this letter, that I am becoming a martyr for my faith in Christ. I can only promise that I will not exert any influence over a family, should the Lord grant us one, to unite with the Baptist Church, without your presence and consent. But I must ask this in turn, that you will not cause to be christened or baptized a child of mine in infancy, unless you will have furnished the verse of Holy Scripture where infant baptism is clearly commanded or clearly practiced. In all things else I can allow you the free exercise of your religious faith, and ask the same for myself."

When James Cuggill received this letter he was not a little surprised that Jane should be so firm and unmovable. Still, he loved her just the same. After thinking it over for a day or two, he concluded that her demands were no more than just, and, if Jane were willing, he would have her come to New York, and he would meet her there and make her his wife. To this effect he wrote to her, and, after due arrangements, she left all to "come to the New World," to be the beloved and devoted wife of James Cuggill.

Of course, James made every necessary preparation to receive her when she should arrive. He bought a very comfortable house, and had it elegantly furnished, and when it was time to expect the "good ship" bringing Jane, he was in New York awaiting her coming. In due time she arrived safe and sound, and accompanied James into the "great American city." James proposed the immediate celebration of their nuptials; but Jane would not enter the marriage alliance until papers were made out and signed between them, to the effect that neither should interfere with the religion of the other, and that their offspring, if any should be granted to them, should not be influenced by either to join any church without the consent of the other, nor should they be baptized in infancy, unless the text of Scripture should be found clearly commanding it, or clearly declaring it to have been practiced either by Christ or some one of his apostles. James cheerfully assented to the written agreement between them, for he was sure he would

have an easy task to find infant baptism in the Scriptures, should he ever *want to find it*. Had he not read in the Scriptures that "the baptism of children is to be retained in the church"? He had read it somewhere—certainly it must have been in the Christian Scriptures!

Well, the agreement was signed, and Jane Freeman and James Cuggill were married.

Two days later they started for Buffalo, where they arrived in safety, after a very pleasant journey. Jane was perfectly delighted with her new home, and the manifest energy and progress of the American people. James had changed somewhat since he had left Wales, and so had Jane, but now they were all the world to each other.

Jane had brought two thousand pounds with her, which enabled James to buy out his partner and become the sole owner of the foundry. He had sufficient insight in the business to manage the affairs with success.

Never did husband and wife dwell together more happily than James Cuggill and his "Jennie." It was only in religion that there could be found any difference in their ideas and plans; here they simply agreed to disagree, Jane attending with the Baptists, and James with the Episcopalians. Only now and then would one go to the other's meeting. Still, they got along quite pleasantly, as they said but little to each other on the subject.

In about a year and a half after their union they were made very happy by the birth of a fine son.

James was in ecstasy, especially as all were getting along so nicely.

But, when the child was eight days old, he felt as though the child ought to be "*christened*," hence he spoke to his wife about calling in the priest and having the child named and baptized, to which she only replied by reminding him of their contract.

"Yes, but," said he, "if I can find an express command for it, or show where Christ or one of his apostles certainly practiced it, then I am clearly at liberty to have the child baptized. Is not that the contract?"

"Certainly," said Jane; "so you can just get the Testament and come and show me the passage, and then you can call in the priest and have the infant baptized, but not before."

James took the Bible and sat down by the side of the bed to show his wife the Scriptural authority for infant baptism. He began his search for the favorite text on that subject: "The baptism of young children is to be retained in the church." But some way he was not able to find it. He had "seen it and read it many a time, but now, when it was wanted, it had turned under," and could not be found.

At last, after making a number of fruitless attempts to find the coveted passage in the Bible, he asked his wife to tell him where something of the kind was said in the New Testament. Jane told him that she knew nothing like it in the Bible. Finally, James asked, "May I

bring the priest and let him find the Scripture for me?"

"Certainly," said his kind-hearted wife; "all I want is the Scripture, no matter who shall find it for us."

James sent in haste for the Rev. Dr. Heynor to come to his house to christen his child. And in the course of half an hour the Doctor was present, robe and satchel. After the usual greeting, the Doctor stated that he was ready to perform the divine service for which he had been called, and asked that the child be taken up, and that a bowl of water be brought. But James interrupted: "My wife desires the Scriptural authority for the practice."

Dr. H.—"Oh, your wife is an unbeliever, then?"

James—"Well, she does not believe in infant baptism, and is not willing that our child should be baptized till the Scriptures are read that authorize it."

The Doctor took the Bible that James had in his hand, with an air of dissatisfaction, and turned to the tenth chapter of Mark, and began at the thirteenth verse and read: "And they brought young children to him, that he should teach them: and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily, I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a

little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them."

And then, laying the Bible down and removing his golden spectacles from off his nose, he remarked, with all the dignity and force that attaches to official grace: "You see that Jesus admitted young children to the kingdom. And though there were some there that would have shut them out, he suffered them. Hence we may do the same." And, taking the child from the servant, without further preliminaries was about to baptize it. But the change from the nurse's arms to his caused the infant to cry. "Ah!" said the Doctor, "how many young children have wept in receiving God's holy ordinance. And, indeed, this was once a bloody rite; but now, through the grace of Christ, it has been softened to a pleasant duty."

All this time Mrs. Cuggill was a silent spectator. But now she interrupted by asking: "Does the Scripture teach that Christ baptized those young children that were brought to him?"

Dr. H.—"No, it does not just say so in so many words, but he took them in his arms and put his hands upon them and blessed them."

Jane—"Did he command them to be baptized?"

Dr. H.—"No, not in so many words, but he was displeased with the apostles when they rebuked those that brought them."

Jane—"He neither baptized them, then, nor commanded any one else to baptize them. Where, then, is the authority for infant baptism."

This last question was very trying to the Doctor's nerves. And, in a manner that indicated as much anger as grace, he remarked: "All the wise and pure and good, in the whole history of the church, have regarded infant baptism to be of God. Indeed, while some of them have been in doubt about the validity of adult baptism, all have been agreed upon the propriety of the baptism of young children. And I think that you are assuming a very fearful responsibility to shut the kingdom of heaven against your own child. We could hardly expect such a thing from the heathens."

Poor James! he was perfectly amazed and mortified at the turn things were taking. The nurse had taken the infant and given it again to its mother, who alone was able to quiet it. Rev. Dr. H. was evidently in an ill humor, and gave signs of departure. Now, James had expected him, as a man of God, to just turn at once to the Scriptures authorizing infant baptism, and thus end the dispute. But, instead of that, he had behaved himself badly: had even compared his wife to a heathen. Still he held his peace; for he did not want to say anything that would in any way interfere with the baptism of his child. And he was afraid to speak on the other side, for fear of wounding the feelings of *his wife*. But, finally, recovering a little from the mortification, he ventured to remark to the Doctor, that if he would just turn and read an account of Christ or one of his apostles having baptized a child, or having

commanded one or more to be baptized, it would satisfy his wife and end the difficulty!

Dr. H.—"I shall read her no more Scriptures. She is an apostate from the Church of Christ. And not being willing to hear the church, she would not believe me though he were to rise from the dead."

This was his benediction, for he retired immediately afterwards.

James immediately seated himself by his wife and said: "My dear, I am greatly surprised and mortified."

Jane—"At whom, or what?"

James—"At what has occurred."

Jane—"Are you hurt at me?"

James—"No, dearest; you could scarcely have done otherwise than you did. Indeed, you were very amiable and sensible amidst all the confusion, and I feel that I have wronged you by the tumult raised in the house to-day. I supposed that the Doctor would have acted like the learned and pious man that he is, and just read to us the Scriptures authorizing infant baptism and put the question at rest."

Jane—"My dear husband, there is no such a Scripture."

James—"But you are mistaken, my 'Jennie'; for I have read it myself many a time. Besides, there would not be so many learned and good men practice it if it were not authorized. But I am surprised at Dr. H. He always appears like a gentleman, and preaches very fine sermons! I

will see him! He shall find the Scripture for me authorizing infant baptism, or I will have him reported to the bishop."

Jane (smiling)—"Then Rev. Dr. Heynor will be reported to the bishop! But, dear, who will you report the bishop to in case he will not be able to find it?"

James—"But he can find it; Dr. Heynor can find it, and he must find it. Any man can find it that will only take the time to look for it."

Jane—"My dear, suppose you take the time and find it yourself."

CHAPTER V.

JAMES DETERMINES TO FIND INFANT BAPTISM—VISITS DR. HEYNOR AGAIN—IS PROMISED THE SCRIPTURES NEXT DAY—DRAYMAN OVERHEARS CONVERSATION—CALLS NEXT DAY—DR. H. AND BISHOP D. VISIT JAMES AND WIFE—METHODIST PREACHER CALLS AT OFFICE AND PROPOSES TO CONVINCE MRS. CUGGILL.

James Cuggill felt perplexed. Ample time had been given him to find infant baptism in the Scripture, and why had he not found it? He had not thought it so difficult a matter, and hence had postponed the effort. But he felt that it was in vain to continue the controversy when he was unable to find the authority that had been demanded, and that he had agreed to furnish. But he was determined that he would never again be taken at such a disadvantage. His good sense had caused him to yield the contest for the present; but he was determined to find Scriptural authority for infant baptism, and then quietly call the attention of his wife to the passage containing it. In this way, he thought, he would gain back what had been lost.

This was surely a wise conclusion. He would, in this way, get all the time that might be necessary; and, without causing any ill feeling, or any unnecessary excitement, be able to settle the question. Hence, chagrined as he felt, he said as little as he could to conclude the conversation.

But he was the last man to be beaten without a proper effort on his part. He employed every

means within his reach to find the coveted text, but he could not find it. But, having used his books of reference without success, he went again to Dr. Heynor. The Doctor seemed glad to see him, and asked him to be seated.

James—"I have come to have a little further conversation on the subject of infant baptism. For I have been very much chagrined since I sent for you the other day."

Dr. H.—"And so have I. I behaved myself so improperly while at your house that I have felt that an apology was necessary, especially to your wife. She must be very angry at me for my unkindness."

James—"I do not know how she felt about your conduct; she has said nothing about it. But what troubles me most is, I am unable to find those passages of Scripture which authorize infant baptism."

Dr. H.—"O sir! that is all easy enough."

These were pleasant words to James. He had not looked so cheerful since the Doctor had visited his house as at this moment. Now, thought he, the trouble is all over; he will read to me in a few minutes the passage that I want. And he could hardly sit still for joy. He wanted the texts, that he might go at once and read them to his wife. And with anxious expectation he gazed into the Doctor's face, waiting for the gracious words that would gain the victory.

Dr. H.—"Your wife still continues to improve, does she not?"

James—"Yes, sir. But I am in a little haste just now. Will you just give me the passages?"

Dr. H.—"And your child gets along well?"

James—"Very well, except it has not been baptized. And my wife will not allow it to be baptized unless I can find where Christ or one of his apostles either taught or practiced infant baptism. And to find these Scriptures I have called to-day."

Dr. H.—"I think your wife is a little arbitrary in this matter. A man should govern his own house."

James (becoming very impatient)—"The texts, the texts, sir, if you please. I will mind my own household affairs. What I want now to find is where Christ or one of the apostles either taught or practiced infant baptism."

Dr. H.—"O sir! I did not intend any offense by the remark that I made. But I can assure you that you will yet realize the necessity of governing your own house."

James—"Thank you for your counsel; no doubt it is very good; but I could appreciate it much better if I felt at all the need of it. If you know of the Scriptures that I want, please let me have them. If you are unacquainted with the Scriptures, and can not furnish me with the texts that I want, I will have to look elsewhere for assistance. Perhaps the bishop can assist me."

These words were said in a very cutting manner, from which it was very clear to the Doctor that he could not evade the subject any longer.

He did not want to be reported to the bishop or incur the displeasure of so wealthy and prominent a man as James Cuggill. "But James must be made to feel and appreciate the authority of the holy priesthood more than he seems to at present." So he thought, and hence remarked:

"You must realize that it is not only my right, but my duty, to give such timely aid and counsel to all my parishioners as I, in my judgment, think they need. And as for my not knowing the Scriptures, I have to say that I graduated in the theological seminary more than twenty years ago, and have very closely studied the best theological works of our church ever since."

James—"I can not stay any longer. If you know of the texts that I am looking for, I will be obliged for them. If not, I must go; I can not waste my time in this way."

Dr. H.—"Seeing, then, that you are in a hurry, if you will call again to-morrow, I will try and have them in readiness for you. Will that answer you?"

James—"Quite well. I will call to-morrow at 1 o'clock. Good day."

Dr. H.—"Good day, sir."

"The coal, sir, where will you have it?" asked a drayman who had come with a load of coal for the Doctor. He had been present during most of the conversation, but had been unnoticed. The drayman was a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and, of course, sympathized with the Doctor in the matter. And, to express his sympathy,

he remarked, as he was about to commence unloading the coal in the coalhouse, the Doctor having just showed him where to put it: "The gentleman was a little arbitrary."

Dr. H.—"Yes; he has married a wife who has apostatized by joining the Baptists, and she is causing the trouble. I wish I had it in my power to prevent this intermarrying of Christians and apostates."

James felt very much disappointed, and I might say angry, as he went away. He felt that he was an injured man; that Dr. H. could easily have relieved him from the difficulty; and that he ought to have done it.

Of course, he did not tell his wife about this fruitless visit, for he knew that she would tell him that the Doctor had evaded the subject simply to keep him in ignorance of the fact that there is no authority for infant baptism in the Scriptures. Already she had enjoyed one victory of the kind, and he did not care to have it repeated.

The next day, at the appointed hour, he called, but the Doctor had to be absent. He had gone, in company with the bishop, to another part of town, and would not be back again before night, but he and the bishop would call at his house that evening. So he was informed by a note put into his hands by a servant.

That evening all was in order at the residence of James Cuggill. Jane was sitting up in her easy-chair, and prince baby, the originator of the

religious controversy, was sleeping sweetly in the cradle.

Door-bell rang—servant brought a card—"Dr. Heynor, Rector of St. John's Parish"—"A gentleman with him." They were admitted with the usual ceremonies. The other gentleman was Bishop Dobson.

James was very happy that the bishop had come to relieve him of his trouble on infant baptism. The bishop was one of the most learned and pious of men, and would be just the man to get him out of his difficulty.

Bishop Dobson—"Mr. and Mrs. Cuggill, Dr. Heynor informs me that you are not entirely agreed in the matter of keeping the ordinance of baptism, and on this account, by his request, I came with him to visit you."

James—"My wife is not willing that our infant should be baptized unless we can find Scriptural authority for it. I am satisfied on the subject, but she is not. I am very glad that you have called upon us, and hope that you will be able to give us the required authority. I have read of the baptism of households, in the Bible, where there were infants; but for the life of me, since I have needed these passages, they have mysteriously disappeared."

Bishop—"I hope our visit will result satisfactorily." And then, walking up to the cradle where master baby was asleep, remarked that it was a very beautiful child; and it appeared to be so healthy. And what a blessing good health is!

“And, Mrs. Cuggill, you are dissatisfied on the subject of infant baptism?” he said, seating himself again.

Jane—“I can hardly say that. I am quite well fixed in my views, believing that it is without Scriptural warrant.”

Bishop—“But do you know that the good and learned have ever practiced it? And you can not think that all these have been ignorant with respect to the authority for it. They surely would not all have practiced it without the proper authority. Do n't you see that, by calling in question this ordinance, you are impeaching the piety and learning of the best men that have ever lived?”

Jane—“I do not attach the importance to great names that I once did, or that you seem to now. What I want is the teaching or practice of Christ and his apostles. If they ever clearly taught it, or certainly practiced it, I am willing to have our infant baptized, but, if not, the practices of these men are not sufficient authority.”

Bishop—“But do you not think that you should yield to the wishes of your husband in a matter of this kind? It can do the child no harm to have it baptized.”

Jane—“Christ, and not my husband, is the authority in the practice of the ordinance of baptism.”

Bishop—“But what harm can it do the child?”

James—“The agreement between me and my wife is, that if I can not find where Christ or one of the apostles either taught or practiced it, our

child is not to be baptized. So far, I have not been able to find the desired text. Now, if you can tell me where I will find the Scriptures that I need, you will do me a very great service."

Bishop—"God's kingdom has ever had infants in it, and, unless authority can be found for putting them out, they must be in it yet, and, if in it yet, they must be baptized."

James—"But what we want is the Scripture showing it to be according to the teaching of Christ. Just turn to the places where Christ baptized infants, or taught others to do so."

Bishop (rising to go)—"I think that we might as well end the interview, and, as the Doctor and I have some other engagements for the evening, we will not tarry longer for the present; but I hope that Mrs. Cuggill will finally yield to the wishes of her husband, and the practice of the best and wisest men in the world." And with the usual formality they took their departure.

Jane—"My dear, why do not your priests furnish the Scriptures? They ought to know if there are any that authorize infant baptism."

James—"I do not know why they do not read the Scriptures on the subject. I know that I have read where the apostles practiced it, and I think that I have read where Christ authorized it. But why these men do not read them to us is strange."

Here the subject closed, for James was in no mood to continue it. The next day, as he was running over some accounts in his office, two gentlemen came to the door. He readily recognized one

of them as a city drayman; the other was a well-dressed gentleman who looked quite ministerial.

"Mr. Cuggill," said the drayman, "I wish to introduce to you my preacher, Rev. Mr. Scott, pastor of the First Methodist Episcopal Church in this city."

After the introduction, and Rev. Mr. Scott was seated, he remarked: "I make it my rule to visit all business men as well as others. The gentleman who came with me is a member of my church. He overheard a conversation the other day between you and Dr. Heynor, in which he learned that your wife was a member of the Baptists, and you were a member of Dr. Heynor's church, and that you were having some difficulty about the baptism of your child. I thought I might be of some service to you, and hence have called upon you to-day."

James had been busy all the time of this introductory address, further regulating his accounts, and just finished up as Rev. Mr. Scott spoke of being of service to him.

"Yes," replied James, "glad you have come. I am ready now to hear you, and thank you for any assistance that you may render. If you can read me any Scripture authorizing infant baptism, you will lay me under lasting obligations."

Rev.—"Certainly; but let me inquire, could not Dr. Heynor refer you to the Scriptures upon the subject?"

James—"I do not know if he could, but up to this time he has not done so; though I have called

upon him repeatedly for the Scripture, he has not read it."

Rev.—"The Episcopal Church has become entirely too formal, and her preachers delight themselves in her noble history rather than in attending to present duty. I think that you and your wife ought to unite in joining the Methodist Episcopal Church. I presume that her great objection to the Episcopal Church is the want of heart religion; this the Methodist Church has, while in all other respects we are essentially Episcopalians, so that I think you might both be suited in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Mr. Wesley, who was the founder, so to speak, of our society, was an Episcopalian, died in that church, and all that he objected to was their want of Holy Ghost religion. Now, I think that our fervency and devotion would suit your wife, and our Episcopalianism would suit you very well."

James—"The question with us is, shall we baptize our infant? If I can find where Christ baptized an infant, or taught any one else to do so, or any one of the apostles either taught or practiced infant baptism, she will consent, but, if I can not find such authority, she will not. And if you know where these Scriptures are to be found, you will oblige me by giving me the references."

Rev.—"Certainly; the authority shall be forthcoming. But your wife would not join the Episcopal Church with you, though you should find it. And, further, if you could agree upon some branch of the church that practices infant baptism, she

would be much more easily convinced, hence it seems to me that one of the first things for you to do, in order that this question may be settled, is to find some church with which you may both unite by way of compromise. And I am sure that you can not agree so well anywhere else as in my church."

James—"All this is well meant, no doubt, but it does not touch the subject. If you know of the Scriptures that I want, I shall be much obliged to have them, but, if you do not know of those Scriptures, our conversation may as well close."

Rev.—"I have the Scriptures, sir, in great abundance, but I would like to read them to your wife. I would like to call and speak with her on the subject."

James—"Very well; call to-morrow evening."

Rev.—"I will. Good day."

James—"Good day."

CHAPTER VI.

JAMES AND JANE ARE VISITED BY REV. MR. SCOTT, METHODIST PREACHER, AND REV. MR. CONOYER, BAPTIST PREACHER, WHO HAVE AN ARGUMENT ON INFANT BAPTISM.

James told his wife that they were to be visited by a Methodist preacher the next evening, who had promised to furnish the Scriptures teaching infant baptism.

In the meantime, Jane notified the Baptist preacher to come at the same hour. She thought that two visits from pedobaptists demanded that her preacher should be heard at least once.

The time came, and so did the preachers.

Rev. Mr. Scott, Methodist, and Rev. Mr. Conoyer, Baptist, were introduced to the family and to each other.

Both preachers seemed a little embarrassed, each at the other's presence. Jane was mild, as usual. Her religion was not of a boisterous kind, but was gentle, yet fervent. James was too much in earnest to be abashed by the presence of any number of preachers. He was sure that the Scriptures abundantly taught infant baptism. But he had been unable to find the texts. But now as Rev. Mr. Scott had come, who had promised to find them, he was very impatient to have the work begun.

Rev. Scott—"I did not expect to meet Rev. Mr. Conoyer here. I came to have a talk on in-

fant baptism. He and I have different views upon the subject. Hence, to begin the subject is to inaugurate a discussion. And as I do not regard it in the line of my duty to engage in controversy, I prefer to visit you at some other time, when, without any disturbance, we may talk over this matter."

James—"You were to read to us, this evening, where either Christ, or one of the apostles, either taught or practiced infant baptism. And I can not see how the presence of Rev. Mr. Conoyer can have anything to do with the matter. If you will proceed to read the Scriptures to us, we will hear you gladly."

S.—"But I am sure that it would end in controversy, and perhaps ill feeling. Hence I would avoid it."

James—"But why are you so careful to avoid controversy? If you and Rev. Mr. Conoyer differ in the matter, one of you must surely be in error. And if you have the text that declares that infant baptism is of God, why not read it? It would take less time to read it than to talk about it. I demand that you give your references, with whatever remarks you may think proper."

Rev. Conoyer—"Mr. Cuggill, I think you are too hard on Mr. Scott. You ask him to do what no man has ever yet done. No man has ever yet read the Scripture where Christ or one of his apostles either taught or practiced infant baptism."

S.—“I can show you abundant authority for the practice. And, since you are so insulting, I will do so.”

C.—“I had no thought of being insulting. But, if you have the passage, I will hear it gladly.”

S.—“It is the delight of some men to object to some things, simply because the Lord did not just say, in so many words, you must do it; while they practice a hundred things for which they can not find such a warrant. I will show as much authority for infant baptism as any Baptist preacher can for his close communion, and more too.”

C.—“If the Baptists practice a thousand things for which they have no authority, it does not prove that it is right to baptize infants. Please show us that the Saviour either commanded or practiced infant baptism.”

S.—“Christ never baptized any one except by proxy. But he commanded the apostles to do so.”

C.—“Where?”

S.—“In his commission to his apostles: ‘Go and disciple the nations, baptizing them,’ etc. Now, infants are a part of the nations. Hence they were to be baptized.”

C.—“Does ‘nations’ imply every individual?”

S.—“Certainly.”

C.—“Did the apostles, then, do as the Lord told them to: baptize every individual of all the nations?”

S.—“Well, no, there were many that would not be baptized.”

C.—"Did the Saviour command them to baptize those unwilling ones?"

S.—"No, of course not."

C.—"But were not those unwilling ones a part of the nations?"

S.—"They were to baptize all that would submit."

C.—"Then, 'all nations' does not mean every individual creature that they may contain? But now, what portion were they to baptize? Were they not to baptize the believers?"

S.—"Yes, they were to baptize believers with their children."

C.—"But how did you learn that he required them to baptize the children of believers?"

S.—"I learned it by Mark, who says: 'He that believeth, and is baptized,' etc. Now, 'is baptized' is a past participle, and should have been rendered 'having been baptized,' showing clearly that baptism should precede their faith."

C.—" 'Believeth' is in just the same mode and tense. And therefore the passage should be rendered: 'He that having believed, and having been baptized, shall be saved.' Hence the believing comes before the baptism, any way you can fix it, so far as the commission is concerned."

S.—"And there is further proof for infant baptism in the second chapter of Acts, where Peter said to the Pentecostians: 'The promise is to you and to your children.' Peter knew that the children were embraced in the new arrangement of things under the gospel dispensation."

C.—“Why do you say ‘and further proof,’ etc., when up to this time you have not found *any*? Is this the way to find a command of Christ? It is evident already that the commission does not contain any authority for infant baptism. Hence, if you find ‘proof for’ it in the second chapter of Acts, it will be proof, but not ‘*further proof*.’ But did Peter refer to baptism when he said, ‘The promise is to you and to your children’? Is the baptism commanded that day a promise?”

S.—“It is evident that the children were embraced in this gospel provision.”

C.—“The word ‘children’ is not used with respect to their infants, but their posterity, as all commentators of note are agreed. Besides, those admitted by Peter to baptism at that time (1) understood his preaching, (2) had been guilty of crucifying the Lord’s Christ, (3) were pricked in their heart, (4) repented of their sins, (5) heard Peter’s word gladly, (6) had their sins remitted. Not one of the six could infants have done.”

S.—“It is quite evident that you came prepared for a controversy and expecting one; but I had no such a thought when I came. I think that you will call in question the plainest proof that may be brought, and hence I am disposed to stop the conversation right here.”

Then, turning to Mr. Cuggill, he said: “Shall we have prayer with you?”

James—“If you choose.”

Here Rev. S. engaged in a very warm prayer, asking God to bestow favors upon that family, and

grant them such a divine visitation as would enable them to know their duty toward their child, to bring it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. And finally for Bro. Conoyer, that he might be enlightened by the Holy Ghost, to know that infants were as acceptable before God as grown-up sinners. Arising from kneeling by his chair, he sang, in true Methodist style, "A charge to keep I have."

When done singing, he arose from his chair to take his leave of all present, but was interrupted by Rev. Mr. Conoyer, who said:

"Bro. S., it seems that you are conscious of the fact that you can not find any authority for infant baptism, and hence wish to cover up your failure by prayer. But what I dislike more is what seems to be hypocrisy in the matter. You simply continued your argument during your pretended petition before God, and had the unkindness to insinuate that if I were as good a Christian as you are, and had the gift of the Holy Ghost as you have, I would not contend against infant baptism; and that I do not believe that infants 'are as acceptable to God as grown-up sinners'; and, still further, that unless Mr. and Mrs. Cuggill will have their infant baptized they can not bring it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

S.—"I think that your religion is all of the head and not of the heart. A man that can coldly criticise a prayer before God, has much need to know of the sanctifying power of the Holy Ghost."

C.—“Were I to retort, I would say that the man who can prostitute prayer to the purpose of conducting an argument, and at the same time screen himself from any reply, has neither *head* nor *heart* religion. And now, sir, if you know of any Scriptural authority for the practice of infant baptism, you ought to produce it; and if you can not find any such authority, you ought to have the manly courage to acknowledge it.”

Rev. Mr. Scott started to go, saying that he would not be “abused in any such way.”

James—“Mr. Scott, I would have a word with you before you go.”

S.—“Well, sir, say on.”

James—“You promised me yesterday, when you were at my office, that you would come prepared this evening to read to me and my wife the Scriptures that teach infant baptism. These Scriptures I now demand of you. Please read them before you go.”

S.—“So I have been giving you the Scriptures, but here is this ‘*Elymas*,’ who seeks to convert you, and turn you away from the faith. Hence I propose to end the conversation on the subject, for the present. At some other time I will call on you.”

James—“If you know where Christ certainly commanded infant baptism, or where any of the apostles certainly practiced it, you can read it here now just as well as at some other time. Besides, if you really think that this gentleman is about to do me an injury, it is still more certainly

your duty to stay and defend the faith. You will never have a better time to read those Scriptures."

S.—"I have read the Scriptures to prove infant baptism. But I doubt if you would believe them."

James—"I never thought that I was infidel to the word of God. Besides, I am on your side of the question. I believe the Scriptures do teach infant baptism. Indeed, I am sure that they do. I have read somewhere in the Bible of whole households being baptized—children and all. And I wonder that you do not just turn to one of these cases and read the account."

S.—"I could easily do so, but would have the same kind of quibbling to contend with that has been offered against the plain passage that I have already adduced. Therefore, I would prefer to call again, and read you these Scriptures sometime when you will not be overawed by the presence of a Baptist preacher, who is simply wanting to convert you over to his exclusive immersion theory and get you to join the Baptist Church. Every age of the church has had its proselyters. And, from first to last, there is not one of them that ever lived in the experimental enjoyment of Holy Ghost religion."

James—"No one has said anything to change my views on the subject of infant baptism. And no one but yourself has said anything to me about joining any other church. Hence you must be the proselyter that you condemn so fiercely."

S.—"But, you see, it would not be converting you away from your faith to induce you to join

the Methodist Episcopal Church, for you have been raised in this faith."

James—"But you tried to have my wife join the Methodist Episcopal Church, and she, as you know, is a member of the Baptist Church."

S.—"I can not stay any longer, so I will bid you good evening."

James—"Wait; give me the references, if you please, to those household baptisms, that I may read them."

S.—"No, I will not refer to them now, but our first quarterly conference begins next Friday night, and our presiding elder will be here, who has had several debates with these Baptists. I will bring him down sometime during the meeting, for he will stay over two Sabbaths with me, filling my pulpit every night. In the meantime, I would like to have you all attend our conference and see what is being done by the Methodist Episcopal Church. Good night."

And, before anything could be said by any one else, he left the house.

Jane—"Our Methodist preacher seems rather impatient. He stayed long enough, after all, to have told all he knew on the subject of infant baptism."

James—"But what surprises me is that he would not even give me the passages, that I might read them. If he had done that much, it would have been a favor."

C.—"I can refer you to them, if you desire it."

James—"Where infants were baptized?"

C.—"No, sir. There are no such passages. But to household baptisms. But you must let me meet the presiding elder here."

James—"Certainly. Give me the passages."

Mr. C. gave him the references, and then, after the usual leave-taking, returned to his home.

CHAPTER VII.

JAMES AND JANE CLOSELY EXAMINE ALL THE CASES OF HOUSEHOLD BAPTISM RECORDED IN THE "ACTS OF THE APOSTLES."

The next morning James remarked to his wife that, as he had a few hours to himself in which he would not be needed in his business, it might be well for them to read the accounts of those household baptisms.

They began by reading Acts x. But the household of Cornelius did not seem to contain any infants, as it was indicated that they both believed (x. 48) and repented (xi. 18).

"I have found it! I have found it!" said James, as he turned to the next reference, Acts xvi. 14, 15, the case of Lydia.

Jane—"Found what, dear?"

James—"Infant baptism! I thought that I had read this account in the Scriptures somewhere."

Jane—"Does it say that there were infants, and that they were baptized?"

James read the passage, and remarked that it was not quite as plain as he thought it was. "But the whole household were baptized."

Jane—"Does it say that there were infants, and that they were baptized?"

James—"No, not in just so many words."

Jane—"Does it say so in any number of words, or in any way?"

James—"Well, no; but it looks that way."

Jane—"What makes it look that way?"

James—"Why, the household were baptized, and households have infants in them."

Jane—"Not always; my father's household were baptized by the Baptists, but no infants. And the same was true of Mr. Lane and Mr. Reynor—three households baptized in our neighborhood, but no infants."

James—"She probably had children, for there are a greater number of households with children than without them."

Jane—"Would you wish to keep an ordinance or perform a religious rite on a probability? You were to find where Christ or some one of the apostles did certainly teach or practice infant baptism; have you found anything of the kind yet?"

James—"No. This is not certainly a case in hand; but do n't you think it probable that there was at least one infant there?"

Jane laughed heartily. "How many might they have?"

James—"Is not the probability on the side of there having been children in that household too young to believe?"

Jane—"To my mind there is no such a probability; for, first, we would have to assume that she had a husband; second, that she had children; third, that they were too young to believe; fourth, that she would have had such on her merchandis-

ing tour with her, and, fifth, that Paul would have baptized them. Hence you will have to assume five improbable things to be probable, to get one probability out of it in favor of infant baptism!"

James—"My dear, you are eloquent. But is it improbable that she had a husband? And what indicates it?"

Jane—" (1) She said, 'If you have judged me to be faithful in the Lord, come into my house and abide.' She would have spoken differently if she had had a husband. (2) Luke says, 'She constrained us.' They would not have needed constraining—an invitation would have been enough—but for some inconsistency, which would have been in the way if there were none but women there."

James—"But you speak of assuming that Paul would have baptized them. Is there anything that would indicate that he would not?"

Jane—"Paul acted evidently under the same commission, and preached the same gospel that the other apostles did, which only authorized them to baptize believers."

James—"But it can't be proved that Lydia did not have young children with her, nor can it be proved that Paul did not baptize such at that time."

Jane—"No; nor can it be proved that he did not baptize idiots and little dogs at the same time. But there is no evidence that he did anything of the kind; and, so far as this case is concerned,

there is as much authority for the one as for the other. What you want is to find where one of the apostles did certainly baptize an infant. The case is yet to be found."

James—"I was not aware that my wife was such a logician. But how will you get along with the jailer and his household?"

Jane—"You might read it." So he read Acts xvi. 25-34.

James—"There was certainly a family in this case."

Jane—"Were there any young children there?"

James—"It does not say so. But then there is nothing against a probability in this case."

Jane—"It is very evident that there were no young children, otherwise they were not included in 'all his' or 'all his house.' For, first, the answer to his question was, that he should believe. Second, 'they spoke to him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house.' Men do not usually present arguments to infants. Third, 'he brought them into his house and set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house.' They were all believers."

James—"Well, it seems that there were really no infants in this case either. But are there no other households spoken of in the Acts of the Apostles?"

Jane—"Yes; eighteenth chapter and eighth verse. Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed in the Lord with all his house."

James—"That is another believing household. But I have another reference—in I. Cor. i. 16, Paul says: 'I baptized also the household of Stephanas.' Is there anything against there being infants in this case?"

Jane—"Suppose there were nothing, would it prove that Paul baptized infants there? I presume that Luke gives the account of this household baptism in these words: 'And many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized.' And still further, in the last chapter of this epistle, Paul commends this household for having 'ad-dicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.' See xvi. 15, 16. Infants are not usually sufficiently active in public charities to merit such a notice as this."

James—"They might have been infants, though, when they were baptized. They would not always remain infants."

Jane—"How long from their baptism till the writing of this epistle?"

James—"The chronology here indicates about five years. But I see some of the commentators here indicate only two years."

Jane—"Is five years long enough to grow from infancy into such notoriety as is found in I. Cor. xvi. 15?"

James—"Perhaps not. But are these all the household baptisms?"

Jane—"All, my dear. And is there anything like infant baptism in any or all of these?"

James—"Not that I can see. But why have so many good and wise men believed that these cases contained authority for infant baptism, when they contain not even a reference to it?"

Jane—"I do not know. Nor do I know why they have believed in a thousand other vagaries, equally unscriptural with this. But they have."

James—"My dear, you are quite a theologian. I think you ought to have been a man and entered the ministry."

Jane—"It does not require any particular skill to defend the truth. If we would just abide by the Scriptures, all would be plain."

James—"My time is up, and I must go to my office."

So saying, he arose, laid aside the Bible, kissed his wife and baby, and started for his office. He walked fast, but his feet by no means kept pace with his mind!

"Why is it that I am foiled in every attempt to have my child baptized?" he asked himself. "There is certainly authority for it in the Bible." And he determined that he would find it, let it cost whatever it might!

CHAPTER VIII.

JAMES ATTENDS METHODIST CONFERENCE—HEARS AN ABLE SERMON BY THE ELDER—HAS THE PROMISE OF A VISIT BY REV. MR. SCOTT AND THE ELDER—THEY MISS THEIR FIRST APPOINTMENT, BUT COME THE NEXT DAY—REV. MR. CONOYER AND THE ELDER HAVE A CONVERSATION ON THE MAIN FEATURES OF INFANT BAPTISM.

The next Sunday, James attended the Methodist Conference, and heard the elder preach from the prophecy of Isaiah, concerning the "highway of holiness," that it would be so plain that "the way-faring man, though a fool, should not err therein." In which he said that "there was not a duty that we are required to perform but what has been clearly and plainly revealed." This language made the deepest impression on his mind of anything that was said that day. Indeed, it was about all that he was able to remember of the sermon. He thought, "If that is so, and infant baptism is of God, it ought to be very clearly revealed."

Monday morning, as he was going to his office, he met Rev. Mr. Scott, who informed him that he had laid off to visit his family that afternoon, in company with his presiding elder.

"Very good," said James; "come at 4 o'clock, and stay to tea with us." In the meantime, he saw Mr. Conoyer, the Baptist preacher, and told him that he expected the visit from the Meth-

odist preachers that afternoon; and if he wished to have a conversation with them, to come at 4 o'clock.

Rev. Mr. Conoyer came at the time agreed upon, but the others did not come that evening. The Baptist preacher, however, had a pleasant visit with James and Jane that afternoon. Several times he attempted to bring up the subject of infant baptism, but James was not at all disposed to consider the subject. Not that he was determined not to know the truth, but he wished by all means to find his theory taught in the Scriptures; and he knew not where to look for proof.

Next evening, just at 4 o'clock, Rev. Mr. Scott and his presiding elder called, but James was "out, and would not be in till 6," when tea would be ready.

S.—"We expected to have called yesterday, but the prayer-meeting that we had at 2 o'clock was protracted till after the time to be here. We all got happy, and forgot the time; and hence we did not get around. The Lord poured out the Holy Spirit on us, and we were not conscious of the long time we were remaining."

Jane—"Did you not have prayer-meeting this afternoon at the same hour?"

S.—"Yes, madam. And, bless the Lord, we had a good time."

Jane—"But the Lord did not pour out the Holy Spirit upon you to-day?"

S.—"Why! What makes you say so?"

Jane—"Because you arrived here at 4 o'clock,

which you were not able to do yesterday, because of the pouring out of the Holy Spirit."

S.—"It is not always the same in its results."

Jane—"Sometimes, then, the effusion of the Spirit will not let you keep your word?"

Elder—"I felt very sad that we could not come."

Jane—"The Holy Spirit certainly did wrong in keeping you away, for my husband needed you so much."

S.—"Sister Cuggill, how dare you speak so?"

Jane—"When men fail to keep their word, they certainly do wrong. And if the Holy Spirit prevents them from keeping it, does it not do wrong?"

Elder—"I think, Mrs. Cuggill, that you speak contemptuously of our meetings. Now, I can assure you that the Lord is graciously pouring out his Spirit upon the Methodist Church everywhere."

Jane—"I have no sort of objection. But I wanted to make Mr. Scott understand that I do not believe that the Lord prevented you from keeping your appointment with us, by an effusion of the Spirit."

Elder—"To what, then, would you attribute our failure?"

Jane—"Perhaps you knew that Mr. Conoyer would be here?"

Elder—"If I had, I would have been all the more anxious to be here. I have met several of the most eminent preachers among the Baptists in public discussion, and every time the Lord has granted me a great victory. Can't you have your

preacher to come in, and I will just show you how I will use him up? Send for him, can't you?"

Jane—"Perhaps you would not have time; and, besides, I would like for my husband to be present."

Elder—"Oh! you think it would be a triumph for Baptist doctrine! I just wish you could have been present at some of my discussions! And, with respect to time, we can remain till after tea, having no other appointment till preaching, which will be at half-past seven."

Just then James and Rev. Mr. Conoyer came in. Both had found out the ministerial visit, and had come to be present.

The presiding elder and Mr. Conoyer were introduced to each other; and, when all were seated, James explained how they came to get there just then.

Jane—"We are all glad to see you both. These ministers have come to show us infant baptism in the Scriptures, and they wish their words to be properly criticised. This is true with the elder, especially, who has had several debates with Baptist preachers, and claims always to have been victorious."

Elder—"We can not stay very long this evening, as we have a season of prayer before preaching."

Jane—"But you said you could stay until just time to go to your appointment at half-past seven."

James—"I think, then, you had better give us the authority for infant baptism at once."

Elder—"I think there is abundant proof of it in the household baptisms of the New Testament."

James—"We were just reading those accounts this morning. And, to my astonishment, they contain nothing on the subject."

Elder—"Perhaps this Baptist preacher was here to twist the Scriptures."

James—"No, sir. No one was here but myself and wife."

Elder—"God has always had children in his covenant, and, unless you can find authority for putting them out, they must remain in it, by divine right, yet."

C.—"Did God ever command any one to baptize an infant?"

Elder—"No; for they would need no such authority. The apostles were Jews, and naturally expected that the children would have a place with their parents in the kingdom of Christ."

C.—"When they brought young children to the Saviour, why did the apostles rebuke those that brought them?"

Elder—"Perhaps they were so intensely interested in what the Saviour was saying that they did not want his discourse interrupted."

C.—"But would they not expect that these little ones had a right there as well as the older ones?"

Elder—"Perhaps they had some Baptist notions about them, but the Lord rebuked them for their error in that respect."

C.—"But what could have given them these Baptist notions?"

Elder—"I do not know what ever put Baptist notions into any one's head, unless it was the devil."

C.—"But if they naturally expected the children to have a place in the church of Christ, their action here is strange. And, if they had been in the habit of baptizing infants by the authority of Christ, their action in this case is perfectly unaccountable."

Elder—"God has always had infants in his church. All the members of Christ's church must be baptized. Therefore infants must be baptized! Now, sir, assail that."

C.—"I do not know in what sense you employ the word 'church.' Is it in the sense in which your Discipline employs it—'A congregation of faithful men, among whom the gospel is duly preached, and the ordinances properly kept'? If so, there are no infants in it, unless *men and infants are identical*."

Elder—"I mean to say that God organized his church in the family of Abraham; that it had infants in it, and has remained substantially the same ever since. Though it has changed in some of its forms, its principles remain the same."

C.—"Did it contain infant baptism?"

Elder—"It contained infant circumcision."

C.—"Please answer my question: Did it contain infant baptism?"

Elder—"No, sir; nor adult baptism either. And this is one of the respects in which the forms have been changed. Baptism has come in the room of circumcision."

C.—"What one of the inspired writers is it that says that?"

Elder—"You are the most provoking man I ever saw. I must prove everything by a quotation of some text in Scripture, or you will not receive it. The learned world is agreed that baptism came in the room of circumcision. But I suppose you are disposed to set up your judgment in opposition to theirs. Some men can never learn prudence."

C.—"I do not know what you call the 'learned world.' But if Christ or an apostle said that baptism came in the room of circumcision, I will believe it, but I do not pin my faith to the sleeves of what you call 'the learned world.'"

Elder—"What objection can you urge against it? What reasons?"

C.—"Several. 1. The Scriptures do not teach it.

"2. Circumcision belongs to Abraham, his posterity, and those bought with his money. (Gen. xvii. 12.)

"3. Males only could be circumcised. (Gen. xvii. 12.) Hence it would exclude female infants.

"4. It had to be administered on the eighth day. Baptism is not so limited.

"5. Adult males circumcised themselves. (Gen. xvii. 11.) But no one baptizes himself.

"6. Infant males were circumcised by their parents. (Gen. xxi. 4; Ex. iv. 24-26.)

"7. It was only a flesh-mark. (Gen. xxiv. 14-19.)

"8. It was the mark of a Jew. (Rom. iii. 30; iv. 9; Eph. ii. 11; iii. 3; Gal. ii. 9; Acts x. 45; xi. 2.)

"9. It transmitted a landed estate. (Gen. xv. 18-21; xvii. 8; xxvi. 4.)

"10. It required no moral qualification, but was predicated upon flesh and money.

"11. Idiots might be circumcised!

"12. It was binding on parents, and not on those circumcised. (Compare Acts ii. 41.)

"13. It was not performed in any name. (Compare Matt. xxviii. 19.)

"14. Not connected with prayer. (Compare Acts xxii. 16.)

"15. Not connected with confession of faith. (Compare Acts viii. 37.)

"16. It was performed with an instrument. (Josh. v. 2-5.)

"17. Upon but one member of the body. (Compare Heb. x. 22.)

"18. It was never changed. (Acts xxi. 4.)

"19. It was not a dedicatory right.

"20. Did not introduce into any church whatever.

"21. They belong to different covenants.

"22. If you 'are circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.' (Gal. v. 2.)

"23. 'Debtor to do the whole law.'

"24. Those who had been circumcised were afterwards baptized.

"These are a few of my reasons. Can they be set at naught?"

Elder—"It makes no great deal of difference whether it came in the room of circumcision or not. In all my debates I never attached any importance to it whatever."

C.—"Why, then, do you baptize infants?"

Elder—"Because Christianity is predicated upon the same covenant that was made with Abraham, which contained infants."

C.—"But this is only assumed. We ask for the Scripture."

Elder—"You can find but one covenant in the Scriptures. And hence it must be the same."

C.—"But in this you are mistaken."

Elder—"Find them, then."

C.—"I will."

And, taking up a Bible, he began with Gal. iv. 21, and read to the close of the chapter: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons; the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the *two covenants*; the one

from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath a husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.'

"Do you wish anything plainer than this, that there were two covenants; one under which the Jews had lived, which gendered to bondage, and was typified by Agar; the other an entirely different one, and was typified by Sarah? And that Jews and Christians can not be heirs together, but that the covenant made with the Jews is to be disregarded and even cast out?"

Elder—"You are taking up all the time. A gentleman will allow an opponent half the time."

C.—"Take what time you like. I was only answering the question you asked me. But were there not two covenants?"

Elder—"It taxes my patience to have to argue with a man who does not know the difference between the Mosaic ritual here referred to, and the covenant on which it was based. The ceremonial law given by Moses was done away with when Christ was crucified, but the covenant on which it rested remained as before."

C.—"Paul says, '*These are the two covenants.*' You say there was but *one* covenant, and Paul says there were *two*."

Elder—"Paul happened to call the ceremonial law a covenant in just that one place, but that does not affect the question."

C.—"Paul is given to such mistakes (?), as is found in the fourth chapter of the Galatian letter. Not only so, but he speaks of a plurality of covenants in addition to giving the law."

Elder—"I emphatically deny that he did anything of the kind."

C.—"Read Rom. ix. 4: 'Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.' Either you or Paul is wrong."

Elder—"Well, I don't care anything particularly about it, anyway; it has but very little to do with the subject, if you shall be able to prove a hundred covenants, if it does not say that the covenant of which Christ was the confirmation was not that which was made with Abraham. There were some petty contracts between God and the ancient Israelites, that Paul

calls covenants. But what I was substantiating was, that there was but one covenant made with Abraham. And that one admitted infant children."

C.—"You are mistaken again, for there are three distinct covenants made with Abraham. In Gen. xii. 1-3 there is a covenant concerning Christ. (See Gal. iii. 17.) In Gen. xv. 17 there is another concerning land. In the seventeenth chapter (6-15) we have the covenant of flesh containing circumcision. Now upon these Paul remarks: 'And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, can not disannul, that it should make the promise of God of none effect' (Gal. iii. 17)."

Elder—"The law was added to the covenant made with Abraham till Christ should come."

C.—"Why do you say covenant, when we have shown that God made three with Abraham? Christ was the fulfillment, upon the part of God, of one of these; now, which one? Paul says it was given four hundred and thirty years before the law. Now, the covenant containing circumcision of infants was only four hundred and six years before the law, while the covenant recorded in Gen. xii. 1-3, containing only a promise of the Messiah, the one referred to, was just four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law. Thus the covenant concerning Christ had no connection with any covenant containing infant membership, except that he came among

that people and lived among them until he fulfilled the law, 'and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.' "

Elder—"I demand, sir, that you must give some Scriptural reason why children should not be baptized."

C.—"Suppose I were entirely unable to do anything of the kind? Would it prove that you ought to baptize infants?"

Elder—"It would prove that you Baptists are wrong in your opposition to it, seeing that you have no Scriptural reason for your opposition."

C.—"You think, then, that we may do anything in the name of Christ that he has not forbidden?"

Elder—"Certainly."

C.—"But you would act without his authority."

Elder—"Well, sir, I propose to end this controversy by demanding that you should give some valid reason for not baptizing infants. What harm can it do them, I would like to know."

C.—"I will give you a few, as I think, valid reasons for not baptizing infants:

"1. It is without Scriptural authority. Neither Christ nor any one of the apostles ever commanded it.

"2. It supplants believers' baptism, which the Lord did command.

"3. It has a tendency to subvert true conversion, by bringing persons into the church in in-

fancy, causing them to trust to that for salvation.

"4. It deprives one of the pleasure of obedience.

"5. It involves uncertainty as to having been baptized.

"6. It teaches baptismal regeneration. Indeed, baptismal regeneration gave rise to infant baptism.

"7. It changes the order of Christ's commission to his apostles; their first duty, according to that, was to teach, or preach the gospel, but, according to this doctrine, their first duty was to baptize.

"8. To be baptized is an act of obedience, but the infant can not obey an authority it knows nothing about.

"9. Peter says that baptism is the answer of a good conscience, but the infant can have no conscience in the matter.

"10. Baptism is coupled with repentance and faith, but infants are incapable of either.

"11. Baptism was coupled with calling on the name of the Lord by those who were baptized, but infants can not do that.

"12. Those baptized by divine authority gave satisfactory evidence of faith, by a confession, before they were baptized, but infants can not.

"13. Infant baptism is generally employed to bring them into the church, a place in which they are in no way qualified to be. Church-members in the days of the apostles, first, gave heed to the apostles' teaching; second, attended to the fel-

lowship; third, partook of the Lord's Supper; fourth, engaged in prayer; fifth, did not dare to willfully neglect the assembly of the saints; sixth, exhorted one another; seventh, engaged in those public charities that were imposed upon them at the time; eighth, exhibited the fruits of the Spirit. Now, infants can do none of these things, and hence can not be members of the church.

"14. It sets at naught all change of heart as necessarily preceding baptism."

Elder—"Well, sir, these will do. I see that you are capable of talking in this random way forever. But I am not disposed to stay and listen."

C.—"You might show these friends the weakness of my objections, and I will listen to you."

Elder—"No, sir, I do not care to converse further, unless I can have an opponent worthy of combating."

James—"You must not go yet. It wants half an hour to 6 o'clock, and you have plenty of time. You must stay till churchtime. Besides, I want you to find, for my sake, some authority for infant baptism. You told the congregation last Sunday that the way of Christian duty was plain and that the Lord had required nothing of us except he had given us the plainest possible instructions. But, so far, you have not shown that the Lord ever instructed any one to baptize an infant. Now, it seems to me that one of these things must be true. Either, first, that the way of salvation

is not clear, or, second, that you are not acquainted with the Scriptures, or, third, that infant baptism is not taught in the Bible."

Elder—"I see that this Baptist preacher has been visiting you until he has befogged you on the subject."

James—"In this you are entirely mistaken. I have carefully avoided any conversation with him on the subject, for I have desired that, in every controversy, infant baptism should prevail. But every time the subject has been considered in my presence, of late, I have been doomed to disappointment."

Elder—"I have proved here that God has always had infants included with their believing parents in covenanted grace; and that, therefore, whatever belongs to the parent belongs also to the child."

C.—"That is, I suppose, you have found that, in the covenant of Christ, the child must believe, repent, pray, exhort, confess Christ, contribute to the necessities of the saints, partake of the Lord's Supper, etc., etc.?"

Elder—"We do not expect them to remain infants forever. They may do these things when they get old enough."

C.—"So I think, and be baptized, too, after they are old enough to understand the meaning of baptism."

Elder—"The Baptist Church is more like hell than heaven, for infants can not enter in."

C.—"Nor idiots either."

Elder—"You will admit the old sheep, but shut the lambs out in the cold."

C.—"Children are never spoken of in the Scriptures as church lambs, or as needing any place in the church. But does the M. E. Church contain infants?"

Elder—"Have you never read what we say in our Book of Discipline on the relation of baptized children to the church? I think you would do well to post yourself up a little in Methodist literature."

C.—"I have read your Discipline, and that is why I asked the question, which you do not choose to answer. Now, I wish you to answer me this question: Do you regard your baptized infants as church-members?"

Elder—"We regard them as under the watch-care and spiritual protection of the church."

C.—"Do you regard them as church-members?"

Elder—"Just let me hint that men prosper by minding their own business. The Methodist Church will take care of itself."

C.—"I was aware, sir, that the question might arouse your superior spirituality; but, since it seemed proper for you to berate the Baptists for not admitting infants into the church, I thought I might ask if the M. E. Church contains infants. But the truth is, you know that all this talk of infant church-membership in the M. E. Church is a myth, and that you give to children nothing that Baptists do not give, except a little water."

Elder—"I will listen to no more of this nonsense! Good evening."

And he and Rev. Mr. Scott retired quite unceremoniously.

CHAPTER IX.

THE PRESIDING ELDER MAKES A SECOND VISIT TO THE RESIDENCE OF JAMES CUGGILL, WHERE ANOTHER CONVERSATION IS HAD ON THE SUBJECT OF INFANT BAPTISM.

Rev. Mr. Conoyer stayed to tea, but nothing was said on the subject of infant baptism.

The next day but one, the presiding elder called on James and his wife, about 11 o'clock in the forenoon. He had just called at the office, and James had come down with him. He told them that he had come to have "a little further talk on the subject of infant baptism. I exhibited," said he, "less patience the other morning than I ought, but really that ignorant pretender provoked me. I have to meet with so many of that class among the Baptists that I can hardly be civil towards them."

Jane—"If you had furnished Scriptural authority for infant baptism, it would have silenced him."

Elder—"I have no use for such men. All they know is to find fault, ask questions, and unsettle everything."

Jane—"Can you find where Christ ever baptized an infant, or commanded any one else to?"

Elder—"Christ never baptized any one. And there was no need of commanding it; they would expect that the children would have a right wher-

ever their parents were invited. They would baptize them, unless forbidden."

Jane—"There is, then, no direct authority for it?"

Elder—"There is no authority against it."

Jane—"If Christ commanded believers' baptism, and did not command infant baptism, then there is authority for believers' baptism, but none for infant baptism; and, if we now baptize the infants instead of believers, we change the command of Christ entirely. Hence we not only act without authority from Christ, but subvert his authority, by supplanting what he commanded with what he did not command."

Elder—"Yes, that's the old song. I have heard it a hundred times. The Baptists all have it by heart."

James—"If you know of any Scriptural authority for infant baptism, I would like to have it, but, if you do not, I think the controversy on that subject might as well be discontinued."

Elder—"Yes, that's the old song. I have heard preacher are fast prevailing with you, and are about to lead you into a disregard of what your father and mother had done for you. I suppose they will soon have you ready to be dipped. I think that your wife is assuming a fearful responsibility to interfere in such matters."

James—"If you know of any authority for infant baptism, we would hear you gladly. But I must confess that your style is exceedingly unpleasant to me. And any further intimation, or

hint, of imprudence upon the part of my wife will not be tolerated by me. And now, sir, if you know of any Scriptural authority for infant baptism, I want you to produce it, or trouble us no further on the subject."

Elder—"Excuse me, I did not intend to insult any one. Of course, you are to decide this question between you, whether you will baptize your infant or not. But I must say that, until I find some authority against it, I shall continue to practice it."

Jane—"James, will you have the kindness to read Jer. xxxi. 31-34, and compare it with Heb. viii. 7-12?"

James—"Certainly, my dear." And he took up the Bible and read from Jeremiah, and then read Paul's quotation of it in the eighth chapter of Hebrews, as follows:

"For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he said, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will

be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."

Jane—"It is quite plain, I think, from this that the Christian covenant is unlike the one given at Sinai, in these respects: 1. Instead of the covenant being in the flesh, it should be in their minds. 2. Instead of its containing infants and idiots, and such as did not know the Lord, all should know him, from the least to the greatest. 3. Instead of sins being merely covered up for the time being, they should be remembered no more forever. Hence, as all in the Christian covenant know the Lord, and infants do not know the Lord, it contains no infants."

Elder—"You are certainly a good debater; but I would like to know if you think that infants have been left out in the council of mercy? Must they be damned, having no place in the covenant of Christ?"

Jane—"Christ has procured salvation for all those who die in infancy; 'of such is the kingdom of God.' But they do not need church membership or baptism to make Christ's blood efficacious in their behalf."

Elder—"I never could argue with a woman. I have met the ablest debaters in the Baptist ranks, and vanquished them, but I can not contend

against a woman, especially when I am forbidden to speak my mind freely."

James—"No one has forbidden you to tell anything you may know on the subject of infant baptism; but what I had determined was that you should treat my wife respectfully. I have not yet changed my mind."

Elder—"I shall conduct the argument no further. I see that you are destined to be led into error, to set at naught the decisions of the best men that have ever lived, who have read the Bible on their knees. But you prefer the thoughts of a few unlearned, irresponsible men, to the wisdom of all these pious fathers."

James—"I shall find infant baptism taught in the Scriptures, but evidently not by the assistance of American priests, who are not posted; but, until I do find it in the Bible, our infant will not be baptized."

Elder—"Good day."

James—"Good day, sir."

CHAPTER X.

COMMUNICATION FROM SIR JOHN CUGGILL—SALE OF PROPERTY IN BUFFALO—RETURN TO WALES—A GREAT DAY WITH ALL THE FRIENDS—JAMES CALLED ON REV. DR. BRAHN—WHAT THE DOCTOR KNEW ON INFANT BAPTISM—ADVERTISES IN THE PAPER FOR A TEXT OF SCRIPTURE—SEVERAL RESPONSES—REV-ERIE—UNEASINESS OF SIR JOHN CUGGILL—VISITS DR. BRAHN, AND THE DOCTOR VISITS JAMES—THE CONCLUSION SO FAR.

Sir John Cuggill, the father of our hero, had, since the marriage of his son James with Jane Freeman, been exceedingly uneasy for fear that she would cause him to forsake the Episcopal Church and join the Baptists; and, perhaps to retain his power and influence with his son, he had not executed his threat. Having failed to prevent the marriage, there was nothing he could gain by disinheriting him; besides, a more generous and liberal course might keep him in "the church." But, whatever was the cause, James was not disinherited. Correspondence, that had been somewhat stiffened and cooled by the marriage, had become quite familiar again, and learning, through some of the friends of the Freemans, that James and Jane were not agreed upon the baptism of their child, he at once wrote to James to return to Wales, and take charge of his lands and all his property, as he would soon be the sole heir of the entire estate.

About the time of the arrival of this letter, James had a very liberal offer for all his property in Buffalo, which would enable him to return to Cardigan with a very respectable fortune; and, being perplexed with his religious difficulties, and thinking that all his reverses in the religious controversy were probably owing to the ignorance of the American priesthood, he proposed to Jane that they return to Wales. To this she was quite willing, and, as soon as all things could be satisfactorily arranged, they departed for the home of their childhood.

It was a great day when they returned; the Freemans and the Cuggills were brought together for the first time in about two years, and they forgot their religious differences in the happiness occasioned by the return of the son and daughter, and a common grandson, "representing the excellencies of all the Cuggills and Freemans for many generations."

But this peace was only momentary, for James was as determined as ever to find authority for infant baptism, that his child might receive that ordinance. Accordingly, as soon as they were settled, so that he could give a little time to the matter, he went to see his old favorite pastor, Rev. Dr. Brahn. The Doctor was very glad to see him, and would have James relate to him, somewhat in detail, all his adventures among the "heathens in America." In giving this account, James hurried over every incident but the one that then troubled him—his failure to have his child bap-

tized. He told the Doctor that he had come for a confidential talk with him on that subject. He had great confidence in his wisdom and learning, and wanted him, without any delay in the matter, to tell him just where the authority could be found for infant baptism. To which the Doctor responded: "There is no direct authority for it in the Scriptures." This remark was a terrible blow to James. "What!" said he to himself, "no direct authority for it? Must I be disappointed at last, after having so long anticipated success on my return?" and he fairly groaned within himself. He was fairly in for the contest, and was bound to go through with the question, hence he asked the Doctor: "By what authority, then, do you practice it?"

Dr.—"By the authority of the church."

James—"But where did the church obtain this authority?"

Dr.—"Christ imposed upon the church, through St. Peter, this authority; that whatever might thereby be bound on earth should be bound in heaven."

James—"Is there, then, no evidence that Christ or his apostles ever taught or practiced infant baptism?"

Dr.—"None whatever."

James—"But Dr. Heynor and Bishop Dobson, of Buffalo, never acknowledged that it is without precept or precedent in the Scriptures."

Dr.—"The reason is, that in America the authority of the church is not properly respected,

and whatever is done there in religious matters, men have to pretend to have some kind of direct authority for it in the Bible."

James—"But if they knew there was no such authority for it, they were very dishonest in pretending that there was. Were they ignorant in the matter?"

Dr.—"I can not say as to their ignorance or dishonesty, but I think that the sooner all our practices are put upon their proper basis, the better; hence, when I am asked for my authority for baptizing infants, I say, *the church*."

James—"But my difficulty is increased. For though the church had the right to impose infant baptism, and though I should be able to make it appear, still I could not have my child baptized. For my contract with my wife is, that unless I shall be able to find where Christ or some of his apostles either taught or practiced infant baptism, our child is not to be baptized."

Dr.—"You have then given up the baptism of your child, for this you will never be able to find. I presume she made this demand of you at the instigation of some of her preachers, for they are always seeking this kind of advantage over us."

James—"The household baptisms, then, after all, furnish no evidence of the practice of infant baptism?"

Dr.—"No. For except the household of Lydia, it is clear that they were all believers, and in that case there is not a particle of evidence that there

were any young children, but very much against that idea."

James—"Why, then, have the good and learned practiced it, if there is no Scriptural authority for it?"

Dr.—"The really learned practice it as I do, upon the authority of the church."

James—"But did not baptism come in the room of circumcision?"

Dr.—"If that could be proved, still it would not relieve you."

James—"I know it would not fill my contract, but I might conciliate my wife with it, if I could make it clear."

Dr.—"Baptists will not be conciliated with any inferential reasoning. . And the only way that I know of in which it will be possible for you to succeed, is to get your wife back into the *true church* again, and then she would recognize its authority."

James—"But, for my sake, please answer the question, Did baptism come in the room of circumcision?"

Dr.—"We are wont to speak of it in that way. but, if we were put to the proof, we should certainly fail. We allow that the Christian church is identical with the Jewish church, only changed in some of its forms; and, as it had infants in it, so should the church now have infants in it. And as all the members of the church must be baptized, therefore infants must be baptized. But this argument is long and tedious, and not at all sat-

isfactory. And, if you present it to a Baptist, he will refute it, unless you have extraordinary skill. I think the only safe ground for infant baptism is that the *'apostolic church of Christ'* has demanded it."

James—"But this involves great difficulty. For if it is not clear that infants are baptized by the authority of Christ, then they ought to be baptized in the name of the church! And, further, I do not know how it may be made to appear that the church has any right to supplant the authority of Christ, and baptize infants, while he only granted that rite to believers."

Dr.—"Well, sir, if a man prefers to stumble over difficulties, he can find enough of them. I think your only safety is in sticking close to the church of your sires. Your wife may yet be brought back by a judicious course."

James—"My wife will not submit to anything knowingly, in religious matters, for which she can find no direct Scriptural authority. But now I think I must go. And, while I thank you for your candor and honesty in this matter, I must acknowledge myself more perplexed than ever before. I had supposed that, if I could only have an interview with you on the subject, you would just show me the Scriptures, authorizing infant baptism, at once. But I am terribly disappointed."

Dr.—"I have endeavored to be honest with you, and have given you the only reasonable grounds for infant baptism."

James shook his friend by the hand and departed more confused and confounded than ever before. Of this interview he hinted not a word to his wife. But even yet he was not conquered. He determined to try once more. The next day but one, there appeared in the *Cardigan* paper the following notice:

I hereby pledge myself to pay five hundred pounds sterling to any one who will furnish me with the text of Scripture that authorizes infant baptism.

JAMES CUGGILL.

That evening, when James came home, he found his wife in very excellent spirits. And though she was always cheerful and pleasant, that evening she seemed unusually so.

"My dear," said James, "you appear to be quite happy this evening. Has anything unusual occurred, that the sun shines on your soul with such splendor?"

Jane—"I am always happy, you know, when my husband is prospered in business."

James—"But I do not know that I have been greatly prospered lately in business. Why do you think I have?"

Jane—"Because I saw in the paper to-day that you were offering five hundred pounds for a single text of Scripture furnishing authority for infant baptism. And certainly I had a right to suppose that you were unusually prospered to be able to offer it."

James—"Do you object to my employing my means in that way?"

Jane—"Not at all, my dearest. You are always prudent with your means. Hence I knew you were able to afford it, or you would not have made the offer."

James—"Of course I am able to afford it; but you mean it simply for a pleasantry when you put your smiles upon the grounds of my prosperity. Tell me, dear, the real cause of your happiness."

Jane—"I am happy to know that you have sufficient interest in the service of the Lord to make such a thorough effort. And the more so, because I am sure that this diligence and earnestness will lead you to a full knowledge of the truth. And while I approve of your liberal offer for a single text of Scripture, still I am sure that you will be none the poorer by your liberality. And, further, your advertisement may cause others to think of this subject, and lead them to know that the authority of Christ is outraged and completely set aside by these unscriptural practices of men."

James—"My dear, you are very thoughtful and very eloquent. But I do not wish to protract the conversation on the subject, for you always have the best of the controversy."

Here the subject dropped, for Jane knew too much of human nature, and especially of her husband's nature, to push the question further.

The next issue of the paper contained the following reply to the offer:

Mr. James Cuggill:—I accept of your offer to give five hundred pounds for a text of Scripture teaching infant baptism, published in the last paper. Here is the Scripture:

"This is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised" (Gen. xvii. 10).

J. H. WHARBRITON.

Of course this was never replied to, for it said nothing of baptism of any kind. But the following list of replies appeared in the next issue of the paper:

Scriptures authorizing infant baptism, in reply to the liberal offer of Mr. James Cuggill.

"And Balak did as Balaam had said, and offered a bullock and a ram on every altar" (Num. xxiii. 30). PETER MEIGS.

"For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean, but now are they holy" (I. Cor. vii. 14). DAN'L PAYSON.

"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake" (I. Pet. ii. 13). JOHN LAMBERTON.

To which the printer's devil added the following:

"And the ass said unto Balaam, Am not I thine ass, upon which thou hast ridden ever since I was thine unto this day? Was I ever wont to do so unto thee? And he said, Nay" (Num. xxii. 30). DICK.

It is not known whether these were offered because they were supposed to contain anything in favor of infant baptism, or by way of derision. But if anything was due to these Doctors, I think that Dick had the advantage.

The offer was kept standing for several months, during which time James read the Scriptures almost constantly. And finally, finding no authority for infant baptism, he began to think seriously about joining the Baptist Church, for he could hardly think of remaining in a church whose prac-

tices were unauthorized by the word of God. He finally told his wife of his thoughts. But then there were other questions involved in this one. The Baptists would not accept him unless he would first be immersed; and upon this point he had given no thought. He told his wife that, if they would accept of him on his baptism, he would join the Baptist Church; to which she replied: "My dear, it would be very inconsistent for them to refuse to baptize infants, and then receive persons into the church who had only received the rite in infancy. They might as well practice infant baptism at once."

Of course, James' father had seen the notice in the paper, and had anxiously waited to see some one reply to it in a manner that would settle the question. He did not care for the expenditure as much as for the confusion into which everything had been thrown by this constant religious controversy. But, what hurt him most of all, a servant of James, who had overheard a conversation between him and his wife, told him that James was thinking of leaving the Episcopalians, and joining the Baptists. He would again have made threats, but he knew that they would have no effect to keep his son from doing as he wished. So he called upon Rev. Dr. Brahm for aid, but was informed by the Doctor that on the subject of infant baptism he could furnish no authority but that of the church. But he would see James, and persuade him out of the idea of leaving "*the church of Christ.*"

Accordingly, he called on James and his wife. He introduced the matter by telling him what he had heard, and how he came to hear it, and why he had called.

“Now,” he said, “the Episcopal Church is the only apostolic church. We have come down in regular succession from the apostle Peter, and are, therefore, the only people that have an ordained ministry. And to leave us is, therefore, to leave the only apostolic church of Christ. Now, sir, I have set before you life and death, and you must make choice between the two.”

James—“I know that it has always been our boast that we were the only true church of Christ, and that we are the only people that have an ordained ministry. But, if it is so that the church has transcended the authority of Christ and practices many things that Christ did not authorize, and also leaves many things undone that Christ did command, I am unable to see that ordination from such a source is worth anything.”

Dr. B.—“But you forget that Christ gave the right to the church to practice according to its surroundings; and that which his people bind upon earth, he will bind in heaven.”

James—“I am not aware that the Scriptures contain any such teaching. When God has sent a message to the earth, he has attested the mission of the one bringing the intelligence with miracle-working power. And if the church has any such authority, it ought to be able to work such miracles as would prove the justness of its claims. For

my part, I think that I shall feel safer in obeying Christ than in obeying men. And on this account I have thought of joining the Baptists."

Dr. B.—"But, my dear sir, you can obey Christ only by obeying the church."

James—"I have read church history from my youth up, and lately I have been reading the Scriptures; and now I have my mind made up that there is no true church of Christ except by following his requirements, as contained in the Scriptures. Hence, unless you can show me Scriptural authority for our practices, I can not remain in the church."

CHAPTER XI.

ANXIETY OF SIR J. CUGGILL FOR THE RELIGIOUS WELFARE OF HIS SON—THE BISHOP AND HIS SERMON—PROVING THE TRUE CHURCH BY HISTORY—IF CHURCHES DIFFER FROM THE CHURCH IN THE DAYS OF THE APOSTLES, ARE THEY THE SAME CHURCH?—JAMES HAD BEEN BAPTIZED IN INFANCY AND THEN AFTERWARD CONFIRMED, BUT FAILS TO SEE THE SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY FOR ALL THIS—WHAT DR. BRAHN KNEW OF INFANT BAPTISM—JAMES AND WIFE VISITED BY A PRESBYTERIAN MINISTER, WHO OFFERS THEM A RELIGIOUS HOME—THINKS INFANT BAPTISM THE GENERAL TENOR OF SCRIPTURE, AND PROMISES TO FIND AUTHORITY FOR AFFUSION.

Sir John Cuggill spared no pains to prevent James from joining the Baptist Church. One thing that he did was to cause the bishop of the diocese to preach in their parish church on "Apostolic Succession." This was a favorite subject with the bishop, and perhaps he did as well as could have been done under the circumstances. He was listened to by a very large and attentive audience. James and his wife were both present. We might furnish an outline of this effort, but we fear that it would not pay for the trouble. Like all others of the kind, it proved quite clearly that the bishop's church had come down in regular succession from the days of the apostles. Every partisan historian seems to be able to do about that much for his party. By a slight manipulation, history can be

trained to speak according to the desires of those—no matter of what creed—who are able to find no other support for their religious sect.

James and his wife dined with his father, and of course the merits of the discourse must be discussed. After dinner, when they were all seated in the parlor, his father asked: "Well, James and Jennie, how did you like the discourse?"

James—"It was certainly a very fine effort. The bishop seems to be a man of very fine attainments. But, after all, I am not sure but we attach an undue importance to church history."

Father—"It is a very important matter. Indeed, if we could not prove that our church had come down in regular succession from the apostles, we could not establish our claim as being the only true church. Nor could we prove that we are the church of Christ at all. It is in this respect that the Episcopal Church is pre-eminent over all other bodies."

James—"But the Catholics claim that they are the true successors of the apostles, and make quite a plain case of it."

Father—"But we are the true Catholic Church. They are apostates, having become so corrupt that they have no right to the claim of apostolic succession."

James—"I believe that the Methodists in the United States say about the same thing of us that we say of the Catholics: That our history was all good enough till we became so corrupt that we ceased to be the true church; and, but for the ef-

forts of Mr. Wesley, there would not have been left any true church. Indeed, in this they have the advantage of us, for the character of Mr. Wesley was much more like that of a true reformer than that of Henry VIII."

Father—"But there were no good reasons for the organization of a separate society in the days of Wesley or since that. And hence, in bringing about another organization, they are heretics, and have no part in the kingdom of God."

James—"That is just what the Catholics say of us."

Father—"But it is known to every one that the Catholics have forfeited all claims to the kingdom of Christ by their corruption."

James—"The Methodists say the same thing of us."

Father—"My son, I have many times regretted your journey to America. But my sorrows are increased when it seems that you have adopted, to a great extent, the skeptical philosophies that are peculiar to that country."

James—"In what respect do I seem to be skeptical?"

Father—"With respect to church history."

James—"I am not bound to believe all church history, in order to be saved. And, if I were, I can not see that I would have to adopt the same conclusions that our priests do; for others, it may be just as wise and just as good, from the same history, arrive at very different conclusions."

Father—"And you are ready to take the reasoning of apostates just as readily as that of the Lord's own ordained ministry?"

James—"Men of equal learning and piety are entitled to equal credit. But I do not know that the philosophies of any or of all these will be able, from any reasoning on church history, to point out the true church of Christ."

Father—"How else could we determine the church of Christ?"

James—"By comparing the present religious bodies with the church in the days of the apostles."

Father—"How can this be done?"

James—"Compare our creed with that received by the first Christians, our name with that which they acknowledged, our church government with theirs, our ordinances with those that they practiced, and our manner of receiving and rejecting members with their teaching and practice in these respects."

Father—"Such a comparison as that would prove that Christ has no church on the earth. For there is nowhere to be found a church that in all these respects is like the apostolic church."

James—"Suppose, then, that there is no true church of Christ? What then?"

Father—"Why, the Saviour's promise has failed; for he said: 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'"

James—"Then it seems to me that the Saviour's promise has failed, so far as any of the religious bodies that I know of are concerned. But it may

be that there has always been a people that has been faithful to the teaching of the apostles."

Father—"I think that the Episcopal Church will compare much more favorably with the church in the days of the apostles than any other that can be found; and that it differs from it only in such things as circumstances have made necessary, and which are in harmony with the will of Christ."

James—"We might compare favorably with any other religious people, and *still* be wrong. But, whatever might be the result of such a comparison, we have added to the creed of the first church very greatly. We have also a name not known to the apostles as a church cognomen. Our officers and church government seem entirely unlike the church of Christ under the supervision of the apostles. We have a great many officers that the apostles knew nothing of, while those they appointed we have discontinued. Our ordinances are as unlike those of the primitive church as one could think. And also our manner of receiving members."

Father—"There, that will do; you need go no further. I see that you have also determined to apostatize from the only true church."

James—"I am not sure that I have ever had any connection with the church of Christ."

Father—"You were made a member of it when you were an infant. You have not only been baptized, but you have been confirmed. And it seems to me a great wickedness for you to speak so doubtingly of the church of your sires."

James—"I suppose that I was baptized in my infancy ; but I am unable to find that Christ ever authorized the baptism of infant children."

Father—"Did not Dr. Brahn find the authority for it?"

James—"I had an interview with Dr. Brahn, but, to my astonishment, he was not only unable to find authority for it, but he said there was '*no direct Scriptural authority for it.*' That the best that might be said in its favor was only an inference drawn from the fact that the covenant that God made with the Jews contained infants."

Father—"Dr. Brahn has authority for infant baptism that is sound, or he would not practice it. Did he not give you his reasons for practicing it?"

James—"He said that he baptized infants because it is a command of the church ; and that he thought that the church had a right to make any requirement of the kind that might be found to be beneficial."

Father—"Well, I think we may as well stop the conversation. But I can not see why any one should become dissatisfied with the Episcopal Church. Thousands have passed through it into heaven."

To this James made no reply. Though he found his father was like most other men, desirous to close the argument when they realize that they are in the wrong, just after their part of it is ended, and before a reply can be made, he thought that it would not be proper to make such a remark then. And so ended the interview.

A few days afterward, James and his wife were visited by Rev. Mr. McCarron, a Presbyterian preacher from Edinburgh, Scotland. He was just locating in Cardigan to take the pastorate of that church. He was a learned and zealous gentleman. By some means he had learned of the difficulty of James Cuggill, and, supposing it to be a good opportunity to render him some assistance, he had called. After the introductory ceremony, and all were seated, he said:

"I hope you will not regard me as an intruder, for I do not want to be in the way of any one. But, hearing of your church relations, I have called, hoping that I may be of service to you."

James—"Thank you. I certainly need all the assistance that I can get. My difficulty increases every day."

M.—"Would it not be well for you to agree upon some church where you may both feel at home?"

James—"It is very desirable, indeed, that we should be agreed in religious matters, and belong to the same church."

M.—"Having that view of the matter, I came to offer you a home in the Presbyterian Church."

James—"Thank you. But our difficulty is, first, to determine what we ought to do, and then we may conclude on the church with which to unite."

M.—"You can not unite on the Baptists or Episcopalians, hence it seems to me that about

all that is left for you to do is to join the Presbyterian Church."

James—"For my part, I am determined to know what the Scriptures require of me, and then do it. If the word of God requires me to unite with the Presbyterian Church, I will do it; if not, I shall not do it."

M.—"Have you, indeed, then, become dissatisfied with the Episcopal Church?"

James—"Very much dissatisfied with the priests for not furnishing Scriptural authority for their practices."

M.—"I think I can furnish divine authority for all our practices. At least, I am willing to try it."

James—"Can you show me the verse of Scripture that authorizes infant baptism?"

M.—"Perhaps I can not find such authority in any single text, and yet I think it to be according to the general tenor of the Scriptures."

James—"I do not see how it can be the general holding of the Scriptures, unless it is held in some one or more places. What I want to know is, where Christ or some one of the apostles taught or practiced infant baptism? Can you find such an account?"

M.—"Christ did not personally baptize any one. But his apostles probably practiced it in household baptisms. And, unless we admit that the apostles did practice it, we can not tell how or when it was introduced into the church."

James—"We might say the same of a great many traditions found in the Roman Church. Can you find a clear case of infant baptism in the New Testament? Yes or no."

M.—"No."

James—"I have another question that troubles me now. That is, what is baptism? What did John the Baptist and the apostles of Christ do when they baptized persons? Did they sprinkle or pour water upon the head or face, or did they immerse in water?"

M.—"I do not think that the mode has been revealed; and hence it is not essential, just so that they are baptized."

James—"But how are we to know whether we have been baptized or not, unless we know what baptism is?"

M.—"The word 'baptize' is generic, and means the application of water in any way."

James—"Would you translate the word by—'the application of water in any way'?"

M.—"Well, no, I would translate it—if I were compelled to translate it—but no difference about that, for the present. I do not believe that it can be translated at all."

James—"The word 'baptize,' when it occurs in classic Greek, is translated. And I have noticed that it is generally rendered *dip*, but never translated *sprinkle* or *pour*. Why is it, then, that we sprinkle water on the head and call it baptism?"

M.—"I think you must be considerably tinctured with Baptist doctrine. I have heard all they

have to say in Scotland; and I am prepared to show more authority for affusion than any man can for dipping."

James—"How can you show any authority for affusion, if the word does not mean either to sprinkle or to pour?"

M.—"It does mean affusion, if it means anything, in the Christian Scriptures. At any rate, there is more authority for affusion than ducking in a mud-hole."

James—"Who has taught or practiced ducking in a mud-hole? There is a difference between showing one's contempt for a practice and furnishing an argument that it is not correct. But, sir, if the word has no direct and certain meaning, as you say, or means immerse, as historians, scholars and translators say, how can you furnish any authority for affusion, either *more* or *less*?"

M.—"I will come and see you a week from this afternoon, and bring some of my books along with me, and try to settle this question for you. For, though I shall be unable to get you to join the Presbyterian Church, yet I prefer to have you remain in the Episcopal Church rather than to unite with the Baptists. I have seen the work of these creatures in Scotland, and I am the avowed enemy of their doctrine. I will prove to you that affusion is the correct baptism, and that infant baptism is of God."

James—"We will be happy to have your proposed visit."

CHAPTER XII.

JAMES' HOPEFULNESS—THE BAPTIST PREACHER CALLED IN—THE TWO PREACHERS MEET—INDISPOSED TO CONTROVERSY—JAMES' CONFUSION—AUTHORITY FOR FEMALE COMMUNION—REASONS FOR BAPTIZING INFANTS—A CHANGE OF SUBJECT AGREED UPON, AND FURTHER TIME GRANTED IN WHICH TO PREPARE FOR THE INVESTIGATION.

Jane was very hopeful; she felt assured that her husband was determined to know the truth, and that, if he continued his inquiry, he would certainly obtain the desired information. But, that truth might be vindicated, she informed the Baptist preacher—Rev. John Bonner, from Bath, England, who had been recently called to preach for the Baptist Church in Cardigan—of the intended visit of the Presbyterian preacher. Accordingly, at the appointed time, the ministers met at the house of James Cuggill, upon the same pious errand, that of dispensing light by which pilgrims might find their way to heaven.

After the usual introduction in such cases, James began the conversation on the religious subject: "I am glad that you have both happened here at the same time, for, occupying different views upon the action and subject of baptism, you may bring out both sides of the question."

Rev. McCarron—"I doubt the propriety of inaugurating any controversy on the question. I am of the opinion that religious controversies

never accomplish any good, but are usually the source of bitterness and strife, hence I prefer not to be drawn into any religious sparring at present. I came to this city to preach the gospel publicly, from house to house, and think that I shall find ample room in this field for the use of all my powers."

James—"I am confused with something about preachers. I find none of them that is not ready to give me advice when alone, or even show the inconsistencies in opposing theories, but, when some one is present who is capable of confronting them, they are at once too religious for anything of a doctrinal character! I do not know that such is the case with you, but you were to show me, this evening, that affusion is the proper baptism, and that infants are Scriptural subjects of the ordinance. You certainly did not think it out of your line of duty to controvert this matter by yourself, but when you see Mr. Bonner you have a horror at the idea of controversy. Was it not for the almost unbounded confidence that I have in preachers, I would imagine that the whole of the difficulty arises from religious dishonesty. I can not see what more of theology a man wants than to know and to teach the truth, and, if you and Mr. Bonner differ in your religious teachings, one of you must be doing a great wrong by teaching falsehood. Why not, then, not only seek to help me on my way to heaven, but help one another along? You need not call it controversy, but investigation. How can you expect me to

listen to you, when you will not listen to each other? You see that I have set my heart on a pleasant and profitable run of conversation, and sincerely hope that you will not thwart my calculations by throwing the band* in the very beginning."

M.—"I came to assist you in having your mind settled on the subject of religion, but I had no thought of having my religious honesty called in question, or I should not have come. I can prove to the satisfaction of any honest man that affusion is the apostolic baptism, but I can not hope to do so in the presence of Mr. Bonner. All Baptists are controversialists, and have a peculiar pleasure in unsettling the minds of the people on the subject of baptism."

Rev. Bonner.—"May I claim to be an honest man?"

M.—"For all I care, you may."

B.—"Well, then, I will claim to be honest, and, as you are prepared to prove to the satisfaction of any honest man that affusion is the apostolic baptism, I want you to furnish me with the proof. I have no interest in being wrong in this matter, hence I demand your assistance in getting right."

M.—"Which would you have me do first, prove infant baptism to be of God or that affusion is the right baptism?"

B.—"Give us your authority for infant baptism."

*A machinist's phrase.

M.—"Well, sir, I have just one argument on infant baptism."

B.—"Arguments are not what we want; we want the teachings of the Scriptures."

M.—"The same song that I have heard before. Your people have sung it all over Scotland, 'Give us chapter and verse, we want a thus saith the Lord,' while you have any number of practices for which you can not present such authority. If it was to save your life, you could not give authority for female communion, and yet you practice it!"

B.—"Suppose that I can not find authority for female communion, will it prove that infants ought to be baptized? Will one error justify another?"

M.—"I suppose not; but I merely wished to show your inconsistency in demanding a 'thus saith the Lord' for my practices, when you do many things without such authority."

B.—"But I could easily show that Christianity makes no difference in male and female, and give you examples of women communing, but this would only be to let you quit the subject of infant baptism, by introducing another."

M.—"I will furnish as clear authority for infant baptism as you can for female communion. And, then, to be consistent, you must practice it."

B.—"I will read from the Acts of the Apostles: 'These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the

mother of Jesus, and with his brethren' (i. 14). 'The number of names together were about an hundred and twenty' (verse 15). When the day of Pentecost was come, they were all together (ii. 1). Peter preached, and three thousand were obedient to the faith and were added to these disciples, along with the women (ii. 1-41.) 'And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.' Here, then, are women breaking bread. Compare this with Acts xx. 7, and you see that women break bread, or commune. Will you now find like authority for infant baptism?"

M—"Well, sir, you seem to be very skillful in making the Scriptures read to suit you. But let that go. I practice infant baptism because the good and pious and learned have always practiced it; because it works well, and because there is nothing against it in the Scriptures."

B.—"Is this the Scriptural authority that you were to furnish upon the subject? Pious and learned men have practiced many things for which there could be found no authority. They have, like you, practiced infant baptism because others did, taking it for granted that others had examined it. You say it works well! For what? Does it regenerate the children? Does it make them more pious when they come to the years of maturity? Or does it fill the church with a nominal membership, who observe the forms and traditions of the fathers, but have no knowledge of personal sanctification in Christ? I think that this

last may be proved to be true! But your crowning reason is that there is nothing against it. Suppose there is nothing against baptizing horses, should we, therefore, baptize them? You promised to find Scriptural authority for it: where is it?"

M.—"The apostles were Jews, and accustomed to infant membership; and hence, unless restrained, they would suppose that infants were to be admitted."

B.—"Were the apostles accustomed to infant baptism?"

M.—"No, sir; but they were accustomed to infant membership, and, as all the members of Christ's church have to be baptized, they would certainly baptize them, unless restricted."

B.—"Then, would we not somewhere have an account of infant baptism in their ministrations? But you must remember that the commission under which they preached did restrict them in administering baptism to believers. And, still further, the very principles of the Christian institution forbid the idea of infant membership in the church of Christ. Paul's quotation and application of Jer. xxxi. 31-34, in Heb. viii. 6-13, shows that one of the differences between the new covenant and the old is, that all in this should know the Lord, from the least to the greatest. All in the old covenant did not know the Lord, for it contained infants; but all in the new covenant do know the Lord: hence the new covenant contains no infants."

M.—"Then, I suppose, you think that infants that die in their infancy must go to hell, because they are not old enough to believe?"

B.—"The commission of Christ to the apostles does not apply to infants, for it demands faith and repentance before baptism, and infants can not repent or believe. But, sir, if you teach that this commission applies to infants, then you teach infant damnation; for it says, 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' Hence your doctrine teaches infant damnation, but mine does not."

M.—"Is there any salvation out of the church of Christ? If not, infants must be in the church or be lost."

B.—"Certainly there is salvation out of the church of Christ. The church was instituted by divine authority, not for infants or any other class except those that might be profited by its ordinances and relations."

M.—"Perhaps you had better tell us what the church was intended for."

B.—"For your good, I will. 1. For the purpose of being taught. 2. Fellowship, or rendering assistance to each other, as every one might need. 3. For their mutual encouragement by exhorting one another. 4. For reproof, by warning and even reproving one another. 5. To co-operate together in preaching the gospel to the world."

M.—"That will do. You are like all Baptists everywhere. You have only the idea of a Baptist Church before you. You ought to know that there are others besides Baptists in the world."

B.—"I had before me the church of Christ in the days of the apostles. And if the Presbyterian Church differs from that, it is all the worse for the Presbyterian Church."

James—"I am of the opinion that the second proposition should be introduced. It is evident to me that, if there is any authority for infant baptism, we are not likely to find it."

M.—"I did not come for a discussion. But I will prepare myself to meet these Baptist preachers. For, though I am opposed to religious controversies, I see plainly that they are unavoidable. Every institution that is dear to the people of God may be assailed by these wandering stars, and I must, therefore, prepare myself for the defence of the right. And I will meet this gentleman here again, to investigate this subject still further."

James—"I am satisfied on the subject of infant baptism. I am sure now that there is no Scriptural authority for it, and that it is contrary to the principles of the New Testament. But I would like you to discuss the action of baptism at your next meeting."

CHAPTER XIII.

GREAT SEARCH AFTER TRUTH—THE MEETING OBTAINS
—HEB. IX. 10 REFERRED TO, AND ALL THE SPRINK-
LINGS AND BATHINGS OF THE LAW OF MOSES
CALLED UP.

A month passed, and the proposed meeting took place. It had been a month of unusual activity upon the part of all of them. James had eagerly devoured everything that came in his way on the action of baptism. And he had been kept busy enough, for tracts and books were in the post-office daily for him. He could not tell who put them there, nor did he care. He was intent on knowing the truth, and was willing to read anything on either side of the question that would in any way assist him in his investigation of the subject. He had determined to know the truth with respect to his own duty. The books that he had received were all in the interest of affusion, and hence he became quite well acquainted with the manner of treating the question, or that side of it, and of course was quite anxious to know how these arguments could be met.

The preachers, we may be sure, had looked up the pros and cons of this subject, and felt that they were ready for a continued investigation. Rev. M. began the conversation:

"I suppose we may as well begin our religious quarrel now as any time?"

Rev. B.—"I have no thought of quarreling, but, if you are ready to give us the authority for sprinkling or pouring for baptism, you might as well proceed."

M.—"Well, sir, my first argument is that *baptizo* means to wash, to cleanse, to purify, but does not signify mode. And as legal cleansing, washing and purifying had been done by sprinkling, therefore the baptism practiced by the apostles was performed by affusion."

B.—"If you could prove by this the validity of sprinkling, would it also sustain pouring?"

M.—"Pouring and sprinkling are very nearly the same, as when the cloud pours out rain, and it is sprinkled, or falls in drops, on the earth."

B.—"Whatever may be the result, the actions of pouring and sprinkling are very different, and it is strange if what is authority for one is authority for the other."

M.—"I do not find authority for either action, but for the baptism which means to cleanse, purify, etc.; and then I find that cleansing was had under the law of Moses by sprinkling."

B.—"But you do not claim to have found that cleansing took place by pouring. Hence you have no authority for that practice."

M.—"I do not need to prove the validity of pouring by the cleansing of the law; but, if you will now acknowledge that I have found authority for sprinkling, I will proceed to furnish authority for pouring."

B.—“I do not acknowledge that you have found authority for sprinkling water on a person and calling it baptism. But, being assured that you have only attempted to prove the practice of sprinkling to be right, I have two questions: First, was water, unmixed with anything else, ever sprinkled upon any one by the authority of the law? And, second, was any sprinkling regarded as a baptism, or used interchangeably with it?”

M.—“I think Paul so speaks of the cleansing that took place under the law, when he calls them divers baptisms, or, as it is in the received version, divers washings. In Heb. ix. 10, speaking of the ceremonial law, Paul says: ‘Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.’ Now, Paul refers to these sprinklings, and calls them ‘*divers washings*.’”

B.—“How many sprinklings were there under the law? And was any one of them a sprinkling of water unmixed with anything? And how may we know that Paul refers to any of these sprinklings?”

M.—“You ask too many questions at once.”

B.—“I ask all these questions to see if you have not taken a few things for granted that ought to be proved. But, to suit you in the matter, I will ask one a time. How many sprinklings were there under the law?”

M.—“I do not know. I never was at the pains of counting, but I know there were a very great many.”

James—"I have lately had the curiosity to look this matter up, and have counted all of them."

M.—"Be kind enough then, please, to give them."

James—"Eight references are had in which blood is said to have been sprinkled: Lev. iv.; vi.; xvii.; v. 9; vi. 7; xvi. 13; xv. 19, and Num. xix. 4; blood and oil mixed, spoken of twice: Ex. xxix. 21; Lev. viii. 20; blood and water, twice: Lev. xiv. 7, 51; oil, three times: Lev. viii. 11; xiv. 16, 27; water and ashes mixed, four times: Num. viii. 7; xix. 18, 19, 20."

M.—"Are these all?"

James—"All that I have been able to find of a liquid nature."

B.—"Did you find any place where water, unmixed, was sprinkled upon any one?"

James—"No, sir."

B.—"How many times, in which water was any part of the element?"

James—"Six times; twice when mixed with blood, and four times when mixed with ashes."

B.—"Were all these six occurrences for so many different purposes, or were some of them for the same purpose?"

James—"In Lev. xiv. 7, blood and water mixed was sprinkled to cleanse from leprosy. In verse 27 and 51, to cleanse a house from a plague; in Num. viii. 7, it was to cleanse the Levites."

M.—"But this was pure water."

James—"In Num. xix. 17-19, God gives a recipe for making it—to take the ashes of a red

heifer and put them in water. Hence, while it was water of purifying, it was not pure water. Water was one element, but not the only one."

B.—"What was the purpose of the sprinkling of water mixed with the ashes of a red heifer?"

James—"To remove uncleanness, caused by having touched an unclean person, or a bone, or a dead person, or something of the kind."

B.—"Is not this, then, for the same purpose as that spoken of in Num. viii. 7, cleansing the Levites?"

James—"It seems to me so; only in the former case blood and water were mixed, and in the latter, water and ashes."

B.—"It would seem, then, that the lye thus formed was to answer for blood."

M.—"I can not see why the substitute was brought into existence."

B.—"From the amount of cleansing which was necessary, they could scarcely find a sufficient number of heifers all over of blood red, which the law required, hence the necessity of taking something else."

James—"Then we have but three sprinklings in the law in which water was any element: one to cleanse a house from a plague, one to cleanse from leprosy, and one to cleanse from ceremonial defilement."

B.—"Would three be called *divers*?"

M.—"But these were repeated with great frequency, and on that account might be called *divers*."

B.—“But would they be *washings*?”

M.—“I can not think of anything else that Paul could have referred to.”

B.—“How many bathings are there spoken of in the law in which the body should be bathed or washed in water?”

M.—“I am not sure that any cases of the kind can be found.”

James—“I have also been looking up this matter, and am surprised that there are so many.”

B.—“Will you please give the references?”

James—“Certainly. Exodus xxix., sanctifying Aaron and his sons to the priest's office, and xl. 12, the same; Lev. xiv. 8, 9, in cleansing from leprosy; Lev. xv. 5, to cleanse a man from a running issue out of his flesh; and in the sixteenth verse, from seed of copulation; and also in the eighteenth verse, from adultery; xvi. 4, sanctification of the priest again; verse 24 of the same chapter, the priest bathes himself after making the atonement; in verse 26, he that had taken away the scapegoat should bathe; also in the twenty-eighth verse, the one that had taken things out of the camp and burned them should bathe his flesh in water; in Lev. xvii. 15, every one having eaten of anything that died of itself, should bathe himself in water; the same repeated in the sixteenth verse; Lev. xxii. 6, any one that hath touched anything which would render him unclean, ‘shall wash his flesh in water;’ Num. xix. 7, the priest, after making the water of purifying, should ‘bathe his flesh in water;’ Num. xix. 18;

an unclean person 'shall bathe himself in water'; Deut. xxiii. 11, uncleanness that happened by night, but not intentional, should be put away by 'washing himself in water.'"

B.—"How many in all?"

James—"I have counted eighteen, certainly. But there is one more in Num. viii. 7; not being certain that it was a case in hand, I did not enumerate it."

B.—"For how many different purposes were all these baptisms?"

James—"At least a dozen."

B.—"In this baptizing, was the water mixed in anything else?"

James—"No, sir."

B.—"We have, then, three sprinklings in which water was a part of the element, and at least a dozen bathings or washings in which water was the only element. Which would be entitled to the term 'divers washings'—the twelve in which there was a washing, and the element pure water, or the three in neither of which there was any washing, and water was only a part of the element? and, indeed, the effect would be not only not to wash, but also to stain."

James—"I should not think these sprinklings would be called washings. At any rate, in each of the cases, except the one of sprinkling a house, there followed a washing in water."

M.—"I have plenty of arguments left. I always put out my weakest ones first. I will bring you arguments that you will not get along with so

easily, and in which you will not be able to have so much valuable help as you have had in this one. Really, it seems to me that Mr. Cuggill is determined to be a Baptist anyway."

James—"I had no thought of incurring your displeasure in this matter by taking the part that I did in the conversation. It just so happened that I had been looking up the very points that came up this evening, and had the references, and, being called upon to give them, did so. But, so far from being determined to be a Baptist, I am determined not to be unless the Lord himself has demanded it of me."

M.—"I propose to meet here again one week from this evening, when I will offer you some unanswerable arguments." So they adjourned to meet one week from that evening.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE MEETING — CONFIDENCE IN POSITION — ARGUMENT
FROM EZEK. XXXVI. 25 AND ISA. LII. 15—PHILIP
AND THE EUNUCH REFERRED TO, WITH THE USUAL
ARGUMENTATION ON BOTH SIDES.

All were diligent for another week, reading and searching; James, to find the truth, and the preachers, perhaps, to prove their respective theories. But the appointed time came, and the same little company were all together again. Rev. Mr. McCarron was looking pleasantly, as a man always looks when he feels that his position is a safe one. His very countenance would indicate that he had some impregnable arguments on his side. But none took more interest in this question than James. Hence he began the conversation:

“We may as well continue the investigation on the action of baptism.”

M.—“I think that Ezek. xxxvi. 25 furnishes explicit authority for sprinkling. In that text the Lord says: ‘Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you.’ Now, as you found that water unmixed was never sprinkled under the law, this must relate to the Christian dispensation, for it is *clean water*. But, as God does not do this in person, it must be done through human instrumentality. And, as there

is nothing in the Christian institution that this could have meant but baptism, it seems to me that it puts the matter beyond the reach of quibbling—that sprinkling is the right baptism.”

B.—“You appear to be in a little haste in getting away from your first argument.”

M.—“You may have that, if you want it.”

B.—“I am not appropriating texts to the proof of different and conflicting theories. I want to know if your first argument is entirely abandoned.”

M.—“Well, yes. I will let that go.”

B.—“But it is my argument, and I must set it up as the first milestone on the road to truth. Paul, then, speaks of divers *baptisms*, under the law, and there were no sprinklings in which water was the only element; but there were fully a dozen immersions. Hence Paul speaks of these immersions, and calls them divers baptisms. This proves that baptism with Paul was immersion.”

M.—“Why do you not attend to my arguments as I adduce them? I do not deny that immersion is baptism, but I do deny that it is the only baptism; and I am prepared to show that God has sanctioned the mode of sprinkling in a way that he has not sanctioned immersion. Come, take hold of my arguments, and do not be so slow about it.”

B.—“I think your haste is entirely uncalled for. You may be as glad to get away from Ezekiel as from the divers immersions under the law of Moses. But now, that you may not be kept

longer in suspense, what was Ezekiel writing about?"

James—"He seems to be writing concerning the return of the children of Israel from the land of captivity. Hence, in the twenty-fourth verse, the Lord says: 'For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and bring you into your own land.'"

B.—"Where and when was this written?"

James—"In Babylonia, on the river Chebar, near the middle of their captivity."

B.—"Ezekiel then probably refers to something that was to take place when God would cause them to return again to their own land."

M.—"But you have proved that clean water was never sprinkled upon any one under the law. Hence it must refer to the introduction of the Messiah, and the work that should be accomplished through him. You see I am going to hold you to your positions."

B.—"Ezekiel's prophecies are very figurative. May it not be so in this case?"

M.—"But what would the figure be?"

B.—"As the sprinkling of blood was for the putting away of sins; and then, as blood and water, and then water and the ashes of a red heifer, were for ceremonial uncleanness, it might simply imply, by this figure, that God would separate them from their defilement when he would bring them again into their own land."

M.—"How can we know that Ezek. xxxvi. 25 refers to the children of Israel?"

James—"The people of the Jews are the subject of the chapter. See the thirty-second verse, 'O house of Israel.' "

M.—"But they were not sprinkled with clean water."

James—"They would all have to be sprinkled from ceremonial defilement with the water of purifying, which, by an easy figure, might be called clean water."

M.—"It seems to me that I am having too many opponents. It is strange that a man who claims to believe that the mode of sprinkling is God's chosen baptism, will continually array himself in opposition to the very thing that he wants proved!"

James—"I am not engaged in proving or disproving doctrines, but I am trying to find out what God would have me to do. If God will accept of my sprinkling, I am satisfied; but I must have proof of it. And I can not see that there is any proof in Ezek. xxxvi. 25. Indeed, it does not seem to refer to anything even in the new covenant, but concerning the return of the children of Israel from Babylonia."

B.—"Not only so, but if it could be proved to relate to the new institution, it would be exceedingly figurative, and would have to refer to the sprinkling of the blood of Christ; for it, and not baptism, has power to cleanse. But how straitened must a doctrine be for support, that its defenders must fly to some prophecy the import of which is doubtful, and then, begging the very question in debate, assert that it must mean bap-

tism by sprinkling. Now, sir, I could refer you to a much more reasonable argument from the same text, by showing (1) that this language has reference to the Jews; (2) was to be fulfilled at their return from Babylon; (3) that, to be cleansed from their defilement with the Gentiles, they would have to be sprinkled with the water of purifying, typifying blood; (4) that they would then have to wash or bathe their flesh in pure water. And hence that the water is called 'clean water,' because while that with which they were sprinkled was mixed with ashes, still it cleansed, and that in which they would have to bathe, was water unmixed."

M.—"You speak of my begging the question. I would like to know how I did that."

B.—"By assuming that sprinkling could be baptism, or a mode of baptism, after having found that baptism by Paul was an immersion."

M.—"You have a convenient way of getting rid of proof. It is figurative, or begging the question, or something of the kind. Now, sir, I wish to say that I will argue this question in a way that suits me, whether it suits you or not; and, if you can not deal with my arguments as I offer them, it is no fault of mine."

B.—"You were not arguing the question then, were you? I am not quite clear on the import of your last speech. Still, it contains as much reference to the subject as Ezek. xxxvi. 25. But, seriously, do you think that you have offered anything on the subject yet in favor of affusion?"

M.—"Perhaps not to you. But, when I come to show you the New Testament practice, you will see the force of my text from the prophecy of Ezekiel."

James—"The New Testament practice is just what I want. Please bring it forward at once."

M.—"I will. But I want to quote one more prophecy and carry it down into the New Testament and see a practice resulting from it. I quote Isa. lii. 15: 'So shall he sprinkle many nations.' This language undeniably refers to Christ. And hence Christ has sprinkled the nations, or that prophecy has failed. Now, Christ did not, in person, baptize any one, but his apostles did. Hence, through his disciples, he has been baptizing or sprinkling the nations."

James—"But how may we know that, when Isaiah said that he should sprinkle the nations, he meant that he would baptize them? Might it not refer to his blood, or the blood of sprinkling of which Paul speaks? But where is the New Testament practice growing out of this?"

M.—"That is just what I was going to show you. In the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, we have an account of the conversion of an Ethiopian eunuch to the Christian religion. He had been reading the prophecy of Isaiah, evidently right where I have made my last quotation; for when Philip came to him he was reading in the fifty-third chapter. Now, Philip began at this same Scripture and preached to him Jesus. And when they came to some water, he asked to

be baptized. Now, there must be something in that language or in its connection that suggested the duty of being baptized. There is nothing in the fifty-third chapter to suggest that duty; hence he must have gotten it from the fifty-second chapter: 'So shall he sprinkle many nations!' The argument, then, is this: The Ethiopian, who was a Greek, and knew the meaning of *baptizo* as it was then used, saw his duty to be baptized, by reading that Christ should sprinkle the nations."

B.—"Mr. Cuggill, please read Isa. lii. 14, 15."

James took up the Bible and read: "As many were astonished at thee; his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men: so shall he sprinkle many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider."

B.—"I think that in this argument [turning to Rev. M.] you have assumed several very improbable things. You assumed, first, that the only way by which the eunuch would have learned his duty to be baptized would have been from something that he had read, while the truth is that he learned it by the preaching of Philip; second, that he had been reading the fifty-second chapter of Isaiah; third, that he had read the fifteenth verse; fourth, that that would have indicated the duty of being baptized. Now, these things ought to be proved, not assumed. And, still further, the

eunuch was reading the Septuagint Scriptures, which do not contain the word 'sprinkle,' but *thau-masontai*, a Greek word meaning to startle, to surprise, to cause to wonder, to fill with amazement, fear or admiration. Hence the eunuch had not been reading anything about sprinkling, if he had been reading the fifty-second chapter of Isaiah."

James—"How may we know that he had been reading in the Septuagint Scriptures?"

B.—"Well, in the first place, he was a Greek; second, he came from the country where this was the authorized version or translation, having been published by the king of Egypt; third, there were very few Hebrew copies attainable at that time; fourth, the Hebrew has it as we have in the received version in the fifty-third chapter, which he was reading. See Isa. liii. 7: 'He was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb,' etc. But in the Septuagint it is: 'He was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb,' etc. Now, you can see by this arrangement, in Acts viii. 32, that he was reading from the Septuagint Scriptures, and not from the Hebrew roll. The Hebrew has the lamb slaughtered and the sheep sheared, but the Greek, you see, reverses the order."

M.—"I think there was no water there sufficient to immerse a man; so he must have been sprinkled, anyway."

B.—"Why was there not water enough to immerse a man on the road from Jerusalem to Gaza?"

M.—"Because the way that they traveled was a desert."

B.—"Then he would surely have had water with him for drinking purposes. But there is no country there that is even now destitute of water for any great distance. And that country was much better supplied with water then than it is now. Hence there is no reason for imagining a scarcity of water. Besides, if sprinkling had been the practice, it could certainly have been attended to without coming to any water; for a man in his position would hardly travel without being provided with water to drink. And, still further, there is no accounting for their going down into the water to baptize, if baptism had been a sprinkling."

M.—"If going down into the water was a baptism, Philip was baptized as well as the eunuch."

B.—"Going down into the water is not the baptism, for it was attended to while they were there. But if baptism was affusion, then there could be found no reason for their going down into the water; for it could have been done just as well without."

M.—"I do not believe that they did go down literally into the water, but went down to the water."

B.—"But we can find no reason for that, for, if they had no supply of water on hand, he would have ordered a servant to bring it. But Luke says they went down *into the water*. Who is right, you or he?"

M.—“Luke is right; but our translation is at fault. It should read *to* instead of *into*. The Saviour is said to have gone up *into* the mountain, and yet there is no evidence that he did go literally into the side of the mountain.”

B.—“*Did he just go to the mountain?*”

M.—“No; he went up upon the mountain. At any rate, when he stopped he was not in the mountain, but on it.”

B.—“How can you go into a field?”

M.—“By going within a certain enclosure or specified boundary.”

B.—“But you would not go into the ground.”

M.—“Certainly not.”

B.—“And yet you would be going into the field. Then I suppose if the Saviour went within a certain specified boundary called the mountain, ‘he went up into the mountain.’ And hence when Philip and the eunuch went down into the water, they went into a boundary marked by the edge of the stream.”

M.—“But the preposition *eis* may be translated *to* as well as *into*. Hence it is by no means certain that they went into the water.”

B.—“They had already come *to* the water; besides, after the baptism, they came *up out of the water*. They could not have come up out of the water unless they had been down in the water.”

M.—“Suppose they did go down into the water, it does not make it certain that the eunuch was immersed.”

B.—"It indicates, at least, that baptism was something that demanded going down into the water. Affusion could have been attended to just as well without it, hence affusion will not account for the facts in the case, while immersion will. This is allowed by logicians to be proof."

James—"The Methodists in America sometimes go down into the water with candidates, and then sprinkle or pour water on them."

B.—"Philip was not a Methodist. But they go into the water because the candidate will not be satisfied with anything else. But why go into the water to do that which could be done just as well without it? I apprehend that Philip went into the water only because it was necessary."

CHAPTER XV.

THE VISIT OF FRIENDS—VIEWS OF MR. WARWICK—
GRIEF OF THE FATHER AND MOTHER OF OUR HERO
—THE PLEDGE AND THE PROMISE.

The conversation closed on the baptism of the eunuch, and it was agreed that in a week from that evening they would meet and further consider the subject of Christian baptism.

In the meantime, a number of friends called in to pay a visit to James and his wife. They were all members of the Episcopal Church. Among others were James' father and mother, and the professor of the high school of the parish.

They had heard of the investigation meetings that were being held there, with much concern for the safety of James, for they did not regard any one's orthodoxy safe who had become sufficiently skeptical to read the Scriptures with respect to the doctrines and practices of the High Church! We may be sure that James' parents were feeling much alarmed, for it had been hinted to them that his wife was about to succeed in controlling him in religious matters.

Mr. Warwick, professor of the high school, began the conversation on the religious topic, as soon as he felt that it was at all prudent for him to do so: "I understand that you have been

entertained recently by a little ministerial controversy."

James—"Yes, sir; the Presbyterian and Baptist ministers have met here three times, and have had quite a lively investigation. So we have been favored with both sides of a very important subject."

W.—"I can not see what interest you can have in the controversy. You are already a member of the only true church of Christ, and I think that you ought to be satisfied without giving yourself further uneasiness. But for you to be listening to the whims of these men, who have no connection with the church of Christ, and have no ordination, and who have no right to baptize any one, though they should settle that question a thousand times, is, to say the least that I can think, passing strange, and entirely unworthy of your religious training, as well as the social and religious standing of yourself and relatives. I hope that you will not be grieved at me for speaking thus plainly, for nothing but a real interest in your well-being could prompt me to say such things."

James—"I have no reason to doubt your sincerity and good intention, and I thank you for taking such an interest in me; but, as I must answer in the judgment for myself, I think it proper to be sure on the subject of my acceptance with God."

W.—"What greater assurance could you have than to belong to the church of Christ and

enjoy the full communion of the people of God."

James—"I am not so sure that I belong to the church of Christ as I once was. I have been forced into a religious investigation, and I think that many of the practices of the Episcopal Church are without any warrant."

W.—"And because you think that some of the teaching and practice of the Episcopal Church is not exactly like what you regard to be the Scriptural way, you doubt that it is the church of Christ? James Cuggill, I am astonished at you. It is not necessary that the church now should be just as it was in the days of the apostles. Indeed, it is necessary that it should not be as it was then. Our circumstances are very different from theirs, and our practices should be according to our circumstances. My dear man, if you ever let go the Episcopal Church, you are lost beyond the hope of redemption. And then think of the shame and disgrace that you are about to bring upon your parents, who have trained you up in the *holy apostolic church!*"

James—"I shall regret very much to have to leave the 'church of my sires,' but I am determined to learn the will of Christ concerning me, and I do it regardless of family relations, or any other consideration whatever."

W.—"So I suppose that your wife has you about ready to be dipped into the Baptist communion. I always supposed that the man was the stronger vessel, but in your case it is not so."

James—"My wife has never urged, nor even asked, me to join the Baptist Church. I have simply undertaken to know the right way of the Lord, which, when I have found, I will walk therein. I am searching for the right way in the Scriptures. Will I be led astray by the word of God?"

W.—"You may, by a wrong interpretation of the Scriptures."

James—"I have no more respect for one man's interpretation than for another, only as one may be more in harmony with all the facts."

Sir John Cuggill felt that he could not hold his peace any longer. "My son," said he, "I want you to promise me one thing, at least. If you are deaf to all reason and all entreaties, I want you to have regard enough for me to make me one promise."

James—"I am not deaf to entreaties, am fully alive to reason, and am desirous to know the truth. But I will make no promise that will not comport with my duty."

Sir John C.—"Even the love of your father and mother, then, has no power over you?"

James—"Very great power, but not to keep me from searching for my duty, or performing it when you know what it is. But what do you ask?"

Sir John C.—"If you are determined to override your early training, and set at naught our holy religion, I want you to promise me this, that you will not join the Baptist Church till I am dead,

for I can not bear the thought of living to witness the apostasy of my only child. Will you promise?"

James—"I will do anything that is in my power to make life agreeable with you, but I have already vowed before God that I would do whatsoever he has commanded me to do, if I can be led by Divine Providence, and earnest effort upon my own part, to know what my duties are. Hence I can not promise."

Sir John C.—"Then promise me this, that you will not listen any more to the reasoning of the Baptists on the action of baptism."

James—"But this Baptist preacher may be a man of God, sent to make known to me my duties. Besides, there is another meeting appointed, and I am pledged to hear what both preachers have to say."

Sir John C.—"I will make still another request: When this promised visit shall have been made, that you will not after that hear the reasonings of any Baptist preacher on the mode of baptism. This will not hinder you from reading and examining the subject for yourself. Will you promise this?"

Here the whole crowd of visitors, and James' mother with the rest, came around him and besought him to make at least this promise to his father. And they prevailed. James pledged them that he would not listen to the reasoning of any Baptist preacher on the action of baptism, after the visit agreed upon. This seemed to quiet all fears

for the present, for they hardly thought that James would be converted by the next visit.

After returning home that night, Sir John Cuggill remarked to his wife that he was more hopeful of James than he had been for many months. He thought if they could only get him freed from the clutches of the Baptist preacher, they might prevail on him again to continue his visits to the parish church, as he had done before, and this temporary enthusiasm would wear off him. So they rested in peace.

After the visitors were gone that evening, Jane drew up her chair beside her husband and said: "My dear, am I a Baptist preacher?"

James—"Well, no; I suppose not. Why the remark?"

Jane—"If you can only hear a Baptist preacher once more, I thought I might take his place, and continue the debate. I think I would be more than a match for any of the sprinklers that I have heard argue the question yet."

James—"But you are not so profoundly read in the history of the church, nor so thoroughly educated in the meaning of words, as they are. Hence it is rather an unequal match."

Jane—"I do not know that the history of the church has anything to do with the question. And it surely requires no great skill to understand the facts of the New Testament."

James—"Well, I guess you will do. But what surprises one most is the constant absence of argument or evidence upon the part of those who

practice sprinkling. They seem to think that I must be subject to all their wishes, without questioning the correctness of their position."

Here the matter rested till the visit of the two preachers. James, however, was not idle, but continued reading the Scriptures daily, that he might know his duty.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE INVESTIGATION OF THE SCRIPTURAL USE OF BAPTO,
AND THE TRANSLATION BY KING JAMES' TRANSLA-
TORS.

The looked-for time came. The preachers were faithful to their agreement. Each had rather an unusual collection of books. It seemed a pity that an investigation, having assumed such manly proportions, must so soon be laid aside; but "*truth is stranger than fiction.*"

M.—"I want to introduce this evening the scholarly translators of the received version of the Scriptures, whom I regard as valuable witnesses in this controversy."

B.—"In what respect have they testified?"

M.—"They have regarded the word *baptizo* to be of such doubtful import that they did not think it proper to translate it. Hence they anglicized and transferred it."

B.—"Not always, did they?"

M.—"Always when it referred to the Christian ordinance."

B.—"This they may have done more as commentators than as translators. But, in either case, what you will be able to find in favor of sprinkling and pouring I can not imagine."

M.—"Nothing, only that the word does not certainly and always mean immerse."

B.—"Does it ever mean to sprinkle or pour?"

M.—“I think it may have had that meaning in some places in the Scriptures. We find the word ‘wet,’ in our translation, in Dan. iv. 24 and v. 21, which is a translation of *ebaphe*, from *bapto*, in the Septuagint. Not only do we have *wet* as the translation of this word, but the wetting is attributed not to an immersion, but to a sprinkling. Nebuchadnezzar’s body should be wet from the dews of heaven. Dews do not immerse, but sprinkle; hence his baptism was not an immersion, but a sprinkling.”

B.—“I believe that the common version of the Old Testament was made from Hebrew. And I do not know that they were influenced by the Septuagint in the translation of these texts. But there is no consolation for affusion in it, either way. For neither the *ebaphe* of the Septuagint, nor the word used in the original, is ever translated sprinkle or pour. The word that occurs in Daniel is *istabba*, which, according to Gesenius, means ‘to sink, to press in, to impress into any soft substance, as clay; to impress as a seal; to seal, to dip in, to immerse. Inf., to sink, to be sunk; to be immersed, as in mire.’ Gesenius then furnishes the following Scripture references, showing that the king’s translators had the same idea of its meaning that he had: Ps. ix. 15; lxix. 3, 15; Jer. xxxviii. 6; Lam. ii. 9. For in each of these places it has the idea of sinking down into or being enveloped in. Hence the seventy translators under Ptolemy Philadelphus thought that *bapto* was a proper word in the Greek to represent a word in

the Chaldee meaning to dip into, immerse, etc., but never meaning to sprinkle or pour. No more can be understood, from the language employed, than that Nebuchadnezzar's body, during his temporary insanity, should fare like the bodies of beasts—be covered with dew. Such a thing would require no miracle in a land where dews were so copious."

M.—"But I do not find *istabba* in Dan. iv. 25."

B.—"No, sir; nor do you find *ebaphe* in the Septuagint in that verse. In the Hebrew it is the twenty-second verse; in the Septuagint, the thirtieth verse."

James—"I wish one of you would just give the references in the Old Testament in which the Septuagint has *bapto*, or some member of the family, that we may see just how King James' translators have rendered it. Also in the New Testament, if the word *bapto* occurs there."

M.—"I have not the references at hand."

B.—"I can give them." And, taking up the Septuagint and a copy of the Common Version, he began giving the references and reading the texts, in each case emphasizing the word employed as the translation of *bapto*, etc.

"1. Ex. xii. 22: 'And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and *dip* [*bapsantes*] it in the blood that is in the bason, and strike the lintel and the two sideposts with the blood that is in the bason.'

"2. Lev. iv. 6: 'The priest shall *dip* [*bapsei*] his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord, before the vail of the sanctuary.'

"3. Lev. xi. 32: 'And upon whatsoever any of them, when they are dead, doth fall, it shall be unclean; whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be, wherein any work is done, *it must be put into water* [*eis hudor baphesitai*], and it shall be unclean until the even; so it shall be cleansed.'

"4. Lev. xiv. 6: 'As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall *dip* [*bapsei*] them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water.'"

M.—"This, I should think, would be a very partial dipping, for a bird will not furnish blood enough to immerse another bird in, to say nothing of the wood and scarlet and hyssop that should be dipped along with the living bird."

B.—"The translators felt compelled to render the word *dip*. But they never rendered it sprinkle or pour. So much for the translators. But if we will refer to the fiftieth and fifty-first verses of this chapter, we will find that the blood of the slain bird was not the only element, but it was put with running water in a vessel. We will read them, which will answer for reference number:

"5. 'And he shall kill the one of the birds in a vessel over running water: and he shall take the

cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and the living bird, and *dip* [*bapsei*] them in the blood of the slain bird, and in the running water, and sprinkle the house seven times.'

"6. Num. xix. 18: 'And a clean person shall take hyssop and *dip* [*bapsei*] it in the water, and sprinkle it upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave.'

"7. Deut. xxxiii. 24: 'And of Asher he said, Let Asher be blessed with children; let him be acceptable to his brethren, and let him *dip* [*bapsei*] his foot in oil.'

"8. Josh. iii. 15: 'And as they that bare the ark were come unto Jordan, and the feet of the priests that bare the ark *were dipped* [*ebaphesan*] in the brim of the water,' etc.

"9. Ruth ii. 14: 'And Boaz said unto her, At mealtime come thou hither, and eat of the bread, and *dip* [*bapsei*] thy morsel in the vinegar.'

"10. I. Sam. xiv. 27: 'But Jonathan heard not when his father charged the people with an oath; wherefore he put forth the end of the rod that was in his hand, and *dipped* [*ebapsen*] it in the honeycomb, and put his hand to his mouth; and his eyes were enlightened.'

"11. Job ix. 31: 'Yet shalt thou *plunge* [*ebapsan*] me in the ditch, and mine own clothes shall abhor me.'

"12. Ezek. xxiii. 15: 'Girded with girdles upon their loins, exceeding in *dyed* [*parabapta*] attire.'

"13. II. Kings viii. 15: 'And it came to pass on the morrow, that he took a thick cloth, and *dipped* [*ebapsen*] it in water, and spread it on his face, so that he died; and Hazael reigned in his stead.'

"Thus we have been able to find fifteen occurrences of the word, counting the two in Daniel. In eleven of these the king's translators have seen proper to render it dip, in one, plunge, and in the other three, by words indicating the result of a dipping or whelming."

James—"But does the word *baptizo* occur in the Greek of the Old Testament?"

B.—"It occurs once that I have been able to find—II. Kings v. 14: 'Then went he down, and *dipped* [*ebaptisato*] himself seven times in the Jordan.'"

M.—"What has all this to do with Christian baptism? Find these words translated in the New Testament, and you will approach the subject."

B.—"Perhaps these occurrences of the word have as much to do with the ordinance of baptism now as they did when you appealed to them as proof in your favor! But, if you desire, we will also read the passages in the New Testament where *bapto* occurs."

James—"I desire the passages very much."

B.—“I will read them as I read the others:

“1. Luke xvi. 24: ‘And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he *may dip* [*bapse*] the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame.’

“2. John xiii. 26: ‘Jesus answered, He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have *dipped* [*bapsas*] it.’

“3. Again in the same verse, ‘*And when he had dipped* [*embapsas*] the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.’

“4. Rev. xix. 13: ‘And he was clothed with a garment *dipped* [*bebammenon*] in blood.’”

(NOTE.—It is now known that the best and most ancient copies of the Greek do not contain *bebammenon*, but *perirerammenon*. This may account for some other productions, such as Luther’s translation. But it seems that those who translated *bebammenon* have uniformly rendered it *dip*.—AUTHOR.)

James—“It seems, then, that King James’ translators could translate *bapto* and *baptizo*. Why did they not translate *baptizo* as well as *bapto* in the New Testament?”

B.—“They did translate it once—Mark vii. 4. In that place they translate *baptisontai*, wash; and in the same verse they translate *baptismous* washing; also in the eighth verse of the same chapter. And in Heb. ix. 10 the noun *baptismos* is rendered washing.”

M.—“But they did not translate the word *baptizo* when it related to the ordinance.”

B.—“No; for they were prohibited from changing any word from the Bishops’ Bible that would interfere with the practices of the High Church. But when their hands were untied, they testified that *bapto* and *baptizo* meant to dip. But they never indicated that it even *might* mean to sprinkle or pour.”

M.—“My position is that the word in its sacred use meant to purify, to cleanse, etc., but did not signify how, or by what mode, that must necessarily be done.”

B.—“Upon this point you have only assumed. You ought to offer some proof of the correctness of your position. But if we were to admit your position, still we would be left to the practice of immersion or dipping, as none of the legal purifications were accomplished without it. But now it seems a proper time to call in question your position itself. Baptism may have the effect of purifying, or it may not, owing to the element in which it is performed. It may mean to wash, as a consequence, if the element is pure water; but, if the element should be fire, the result would not be a washing. Some, you know, were to be baptized with fire.”

M.—“I think I can prove that baptism and purifying were used interchangeably in the Scriptures. In John iii. 25 it seems quite clear that the one was tantamount to the other. Just after

stating that John baptized in Enon, the apostle says: 'Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying. And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him.' "

B.—"You know that the meaning of a word is not to be gathered from a single occurrence of it, especially when, in that occurrence, the import is doubtful. Baptizing in water would have the effect of purifying, provided it was an immersion; but if it had not been an immersion, it would not have had such an effect. Now, to hang may generally mean to take life, but every one knows that to take life would be a secondary, and by no means a primary, meaning. And though the two might, with propriety, be used interchangeably, it would be hard to prove that to hang means always to take life, and still harder to prove that it means to take life in '*any way*'! John's baptism might be taken as a purification by a Jew, who bathed himself in water in order to *this*. And it may have originated the controversy. But, if his baptism had been a sprinkling or pouring, it would not have originated any such debate, for the Jews never accomplished the purification of any person or thing by sprinkling simply water upon it; nor was the sprinkling or pouring of water, unmixed with anything else, ever any part of purification. But the probable controversy was: First, what is

the nature of this purification—is it fleshly, as those of the law? or spiritual, in giving ‘the people knowledge of salvation by the remission of their sins’ (Luke i. 77)? And, second, who has the right to minister such a baptism or bathing for such a purpose? Hence, after the controversy, John’s disciples come to him with the declaration about Christ’s baptizing. For John had testified ‘that he is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.’ ”

M.—“You have a very ingenious way of turning everything to your own account. But I will show you that baptism took place under circumstances that preclude the idea of immersion. But I think I had better do that at our next meeting.”

James—“But I have promised that I will not allow this Baptist minister to continue his visits here, or hear his arguments any further upon the subject of baptism.”

M.—“But may I come and continue the readings on this question?”

James—“I shall be pleased to have you do so, but I will reserve the right to ask questions.”

Here the matter ended for a week.

CHAPTER XVII.

ANOTHER VISIT FROM REV. MR. M'CARRON—WHAT THE
LEARNED GROVES HAD TO SAY ABOUT BAPTO AND
BAPTIZO—HOW HE WOULD RENDER IMMERSION INTO
GREEK—THE THREE THOUSAND ON THE PENTECOST
—HOW IMMERSE SO MANY, AND WHERE FIND THE
WATER?

A week more passed, and Rev. Mr. McCarron called again. Sir John Cuggill and wife happened to be on a visit at the same time, and were agreeably surprised to find the Presbyterian preacher undertaking to defend the practices of the High Church.

Of course, Rev. M. was an orthodox gentleman, and so was Sir Cuggill—all orthodox, except those obnoxious Baptists! Each could trace his church history right back to the apostle Peter. All had descended from a common stock, except the *pesky* Baptists, who had no origin or descent! It is really refreshing to witness the fondness that one sect has for another when they are fearful of the ravages of a common foe; but just remove the enemy, and their appreciation for each other will not amount to much!

Rev. M. began the conversation by remarking to Sir Cuggill that he had fears of great injury being done by the erroneous teachings of the Baptists, and that he was doing all that he could to

hold in check the pernicious influence of their doctrine.

Sir C.—"I am heartily glad that some one has the courage to meet these innovators, for it seems to me that the whole of the Episcopal clergy are asleep, or else have lost all care for the souls of men. These heretics are going on and meeting with encouraging success everywhere, and hardly a man anywhere dares to oppose them."

M.—"I have long thought that the clergy of the Episcopal Church had left off their watch; besides, the position that they occupy hinders their success in meeting this heresy. They put everything on the basis of apostolic succession, but the people that the Baptists get care little for any argument of that nature; hence my opinion is, that if this dipping matter is to be met and set at naught, it will have to be done by the Presbyterian Church. We feel at liberty to meet these men in the arena and contend with them open-handed, and with their own weapons."

James.—"I am not a particle interested in your church admiration arrangement; what I would like to know is, must I be immersed, or not? If you have anything more for me on this subject, I would like to have it; this evening, I believe, you were to bring some unanswerable arguments in favor of affusion."

M.—"Well, sir, I have a new lexicon prepared by Mr. Groves, especially for students of the New Testament. In this work, one of the mean-

ings of *bapto* is to sprinkle. Now, sir, this is high authority for sprinkling."

James—"I have two questions to ask: First, does any one else give 'sprinkle' as a definition of *bapto*? and, second, is *bapto* the word from which we have the ordinance?"

M.—"I know of no one else who gives 'sprinkle' as any meaning of *bapto*; but Mr. Groves is respectable authority. Second, *bapto* is not the word, of course, from which we have 'baptize' in the New Testament, but it is the root of that word, and, sprinkle being a root meaning, it may also be a branch meaning."

James—"But would not Mr. Groves put 'sprinkle' into all the derivatives, if he thought they belonged there?"

M.—"Well, at least we are not entirely without lexical authority for affusion."

James—"I am not so sure of that! Does any lexicographer give 'sprinkle' as any meaning of *baptizo*?"

M.—"I do not know that any one has."

James—"Then, when you sprinkle and call it baptism, you do so without any lexical authority; and, further, I mind that you said that *baptizo* was a generic word, and hence did not express the idea of any particular mode of action. But your author seems to think differently. Sprinkle, if it was any meaning of *baptizo*, or even of *bapto*, is not generic, but specific, and hence, if it is any meaning, it is the only meaning, for a word can

not have two specific meanings. Now, if Mr. Groves has given to *bapto* any other specific definition than 'to sprinkle,' he is either wanting in 'scholarship or principle.' " And he reached out his hand and took the work referred to, which was then lying on the center-table, along with a number of volumes that Rev. M. had brought along as books of reference. He turned to *baptizo* and began to read: "*Baptizo*: to dip, immerse, immerge, plunge; to wash, cleanse, purify; to baptize; to depress, humble, overwhelm."

"There is no sprinkle in that, nothing but immerse and secondary corresponding meanings. But I will read what he says about *bapto*. 'To dip, plunge, immerse; to wash; to wet, moisten, sprinkle; to steep, imbue; to dye, stain, color.' Now, I can not see how a man who believes 'to dip, plunge, immerse,' to be the primary meaning of a word, could regard 'to sprinkle' as a meaning! No word can mean both to dip and to sprinkle! But I see that Mr. Groves has another department in his lexicon, 'English into Greek.' Here is the way he would translate 'immersion' into Greek: 'Immersion, *baptismos. embamma.*' From this it appears that, in the estimation of your author, the strongest word in the Greek, to express the idea of immersion, is the noun *baptismos*, from *baptizo*. And now I have another question. If this author is reliable, when the Saviour commissioned his apostles to preach the gospel to every creature, and baptize the nations, if he had intended them

to understand him to immerse the nations, how could he have communicated that thought to them, if it is not contained in the language that he did employ, since your author thinks that he used the strongest word contained in the Greek to express that thought? Or, if he did not tell the disciples to immerse the nations, how *could* he have told them to do so?"

M.—"I think we may as well leave Mr. Groves. I can't say that I appreciate him very highly, anyway. But it is evident that there are cases of baptism recorded in the New Testament where immersion was out of the question altogether."

James—"But if you succeed in finding such cases, it will by no means prove that sprinkling or pouring is right."

M.—"I only want to get away from the idea that immersion is necessary to baptism, and then I will be able to show you the true baptism, which the Lord sanctioned. And, for this purpose, I will take, first, the baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost. (1) Peter had not sufficient time to immerse so many. (2) The people would not have been prepared with a change of clothing for such a dipping. (3) There could not be found a convenient place for the immersion."

James—"How, then, do you suppose they were baptized? For to sprinkle or pour seems to take up just as much time as to immerse."

M.—"I suppose that Peter took a hyssop bush and dipped it in water, and then sprinkled the crowd."

James—"But Peter told them to repent and be baptized; and, in that way of herding them, he might sprinkle some that were not prepared for it!"

M.—"Those desiring baptism could easily be had to congregate themselves together, and there would be no liability of baptizing the wrong ones."

James—"But they were to baptize in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, which I always supposed they pronounced in the baptism of each individual person. But if he baptized them in great numbers, the formula must have been omitted. I would like to know, then, if you regard the formula, as given in Matt. xxviii. 19, necessary to a Christian baptism."

M.—"Well, yes, but we do not know that it was used at that time. And if it was, then some other baptism than immersion must have been practiced; for Peter could not have immersed that number."

James—"But Peter was not the only one that might have baptized. To say the least of it, there were eleven others. For all the apostles were certainly authorized to baptize. And mind that the Saviour had sent out seventy others, and they were probably among the one hundred and twenty. If so, there would be eighty-two administrators. If there were eighty-two baptists, there would only

be about thirty-six and a fraction to the man; and if only twelve, still there would be but two hundred and fifty to the administrator. As it was 'but the third hour of the day,' or 9 o'clock A. M., there would be nine hours to do this in. But if there were not more than eight hours, there would be but thirty-one per hour to the baptist. And, besides all this, there is no evidence that the three thousand were all baptized that day. They were added to the one hundred and twenty that day, but may have been baptized before that, just the same as the one hundred and twenty had."

M.—"Your ingenuity, I discover, is sufficient for any emergency. But where will you find water for them to be immersed in? Especially, where will you find opportunity for that number of men to officiate at the same time?"

James—"I find the following pools about Jerusalem. (1) Pool of Bethesda (John v. 7), which was 131 feet wide by 366 feet long, besides a neck 45 feet wide by 142 feet long, thus making a pool 508 feet in length. (2) The pool of Siloam (John ix. 7-11), which was 16 feet wide by 90 feet long. (3) Pool of Hezekiah, 126 feet wide by 250 feet in length. (4) Upper pool of Gihon, 208 by 315 feet. (5) Lower pool of Gihon, 260 by 600 feet. All these were entered by stone steps, some twelve inches wide and descending each step about eight inches. Besides, there were the streams of Kedron and Gihon and Jehoshaphat. Surely, there was no lack of water."

M.—"But they used the water from these pools for drinking purposes, and hence they would not allow them to immerse in them."

James—"They were not as particular in this respect as we are. But, whatever may be known of the other pools, we do know that no such prohibition rested upon the pool of Bethesda; for, in John v. 2-7, we learn that in it the impotent people bathed themselves. And we might conclude that the same was true with respect to Siloam, for the Saviour, when he had made clay and put it upon the eyes of the blind man, told him to go and wash in the pool of Siloam. Besides, it is called the 'fleece pool,' or pool of sheepskins, where, as tradition goes, they washed fleeces and pelts. I might have mentioned the fountain of the virgin and Solomon's pool, but these are more difficult to identify. But with these two pools, Bethesda and Siloam, there was room enough, placing the men ten feet apart, for 144 baptists to have been engaged at the same time."

M.—"You seem to have matured arguments in favor of immersion. I think that Rev. Mr. Bonner must be keeping you posted."

Sir C.—"I think you might as well break up these controversies, for I can not see what good they are going to accomplish."

Here the conversation closed for the evening; Rev. M. informing them, as usual, that he possessed other arguments in favor of sprinkling, which he would produce at the next meeting.

CHAPTER XVIII.

JOHN BAPTIZED IN BETHABARA BEYOND JORDAN—
WHAT DOES IT MEAN?—WHY DID HE BAPTIZE AT
ENON?—HOW BAPTIZE SO MANY?—MATT. III. 5—
WHO WERE BAPTIZED BY JOHN?—TWO OPPONENTS.

Another week passed with the usual anxiety. James felt that, if he was to be deprived of the privilege of hearing both sides of the story, he ought to prepare himself for as thorough an investigation of the subject as possible. Hence dictionaries, lexicons, commentaries, histories, and everything that could be found that would furnish any light on the subject, were obtained and consulted. The evening came, and Rev. M. began:

“As I was about to show, when our last meeting came to an end, that baptism was performed under circumstances precluding the idea of an immersion, I will now read a few Scriptures for that purpose.”

James—“But this will be taking for granted what ought to be proved, that something else than immersion would be baptism. And still, if you could prove that they could not, at a given time and place, have been immersed, it would not prove that sprinkling and pouring would be baptism. Better show, from the meaning of the word, that affusion might be baptism, first, and then it will be time enough to see how it was performed in the New Testament; or find that it could not be an

immersion, and it would leave the case in the possession of affusion."

M.—"I wish to select my own way of investigating this subject. I want to find instances in which immersion was not performed, and then I will show you how it was performed. And I am sure, if Rev. B. were here himself, he would not object to my pursuing this course."

James—"I do not wish to stop the investigation. I only want to pursue the shortest method, and the more logical and safe one."

M.—"I will first read John i. 28: 'These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.' Now, the word 'Bethabara' means house of the ford, or house of the crossing. And hence it is quite evident that John baptized in a house, and not in a stream, as some suppose."

James—"I think your reasoning unsound. (1) If it can be proved John baptized in a house, it does not prove it impossible for him to have immersed; for now, in most cases, immersion is performed in a house. (2) All words in the Hebrew beginning with *beth* mean house, of some kind; for, according to Gesenius, this was the most common word for house. I have gathered a few of these *beths*. Bethhaggan, *house of the garden* (II. Kings ix. 27); Bethanoth, *house of echo* (John xv. 59); Bethany, *house of dates* (Mark xi. 1); Bethaven, *house of badness* (Josh. xviii. 12)."

M.—"You may discontinue those names, so far as I am concerned. I know the word *beth* in the

Hebrew means house, as well as you do, and have no need of further instruction."

James—"Then, why did you reason, from the meaning of this word, that John must have done his baptizing in a house or a building, when you know the word meant a town or village? Your system of reasoning is mysterious."

M.—"I think I ought to be allowed to go on with my reading till I shall have reached the desired point, or, in other words, shall have finished the argument."

James—"But my idea is, that every proof that you introduce should be examined closely. And if the desired proof be not found, then the argument must be abandoned. Now, if John baptized in a house, we have no means of knowing it. There is certainly no declaration of that kind. Besides, our best commentators allow that this was the Beth-barah of Judges vii. 24, and was situated on the east bank of the Jordan."

M.—"Even that would indicate that the baptism was not performed in a stream of water; for there was no stream running through the village."

James—"I believe that a city or town, situated on a river, carries its limits to the middle of the stream."

M.—"But the Saviour came into this place, and abode. For in John x. 40 we read: 'And went away again beyond Jordan, into the place where John at first baptized; and there he abode.' He certainly did not dwell in the water, or in the

river; and, if not, then John did not baptize in the river."

James—"What is meant by 'the place where John first baptized'? Does it mean the very exact space, or simply the city or village in which he baptized?"

M.—"I think we might as well pass this."

James—"I think not. At least, you ought to answer my question. What is meant by 'the place,' etc.?"

M.—"The village, I suppose."

James—"Well, then, why refer to this passage to prove that John did not baptize in the river? And if you had proved that he had baptized in a house, still it would not have proved that he did not immerse."

M.—"I see you want it all to be on the side of immersion, but I will show you something right here that you will not manage so easily."

James—"But I am not done yet with the place where John baptized. In Matt. iii. 6 it is declared that he baptized in Jordan. In Mark i. 5 it is still a little plainer—'*in the river of Jordan.*' Now, sir, upon the hypothesis of affusion, there is no accounting for the administration of baptism in the river of Jordan."

M.—" 'In Jordan' may only mean to the edge of Jordan, or down on its banks."

James—"How do you know this?"

M.—"In Josh. iii. 15 it is said, 'And as they that bare the ark were come into Jordan, and the

feet of the priests that bare the ark were dipped in the brim of the water,' etc."

James—"But you will admit that this was certainly in the water."

M.—"But it was not of sufficient depth for an immersion of a man's body."

James—"Certainly no one contends that in the river Jordan meant any particular depth; but affusion will not account for the fact of their going in at all. Hence this whole argument seems to turn on the other side, and to favor immersion."

M.—"I had come to regard Rev. B. as the most artful debater that I ever saw, but I am about to conclude that you are the better tactician of the two. And you seem equally determined upon proving exclusive immersion."

James—"I am not trying to prove exclusive immersion or anything else, but simply examining your proof for affusion. I have been hoping all the time that you would offer something that could not be met, but I have been disappointed. Indeed, all your proofs seem to rank themselves on the other side when properly understood."

M.—"I will pass on without further attention to this argument."

Jane—"But I have a question that I would like to have answered."

M.—"Well, what is it?"

Jane—"In John iii. 23 it is said: 'And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came, and

were baptized.' How can affusion account for this language?"

M.—"This is a very indefinite passage. We can not tell where Enon was. And we might as well pass this Scripture without troubling our brains with it."

Jane—"I can not see any particular need of being able to identify the place, in order to find the meaning of the passage. It declares that 'John baptized there, because there was much water there.' And as much water is not necessary to the practice of affusion, this language can only be accounted for by allowing that he immersed."

M.—"Perhaps a great number of persons were attendant upon John's ministry; and, the animals upon which they rode needing water, John sought such a place."

Jane—"But it is not so stated by the evangelist; and, further, we know the people were not in the habit of riding, except when going a great distance. In the fourteenth chapter of Matthew, from the thirteenth to the twenty-first verses, inclusive, we have the well-known custom of the people well described in this respect. The Saviour's journeys and those of the apostles were all, so far as we may learn, accomplished on foot or by ship, unless it can be proved that Claudius Lysias gave Paul a ride down to Casarea, when the forty Jews had sworn to kill him. Hence it is quite certain that the only reason that John selected Enon was to baptize there."

M.—"I am not particular about a single passage. Suppose it does favor immersion, it does not prove that they all favor immersion. And now I am ready to introduce an argument that can not be met. I read Matt. iii. 5: 'Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins.' Now, the number of people in the region of country thus named could not have been less than three millions. If John was baptizing a year and a half, and no one pretends that he was baptizing longer than that, then he was 547 days and 22 hours immersing; or, if he immersed ten hours per day, then he was engaged 5,491 hours, or 329,460 minutes. Hence you see that he would have had to baptize more than nine persons every minute. This he could not have done without performing a miracle; and it is said that 'John performed no miracle' (John x. 41). Now, as it was impossible for him to have immersed that number in that length of time, it is certain that he did not immerse them. Of course, this will not decide how he did baptize; but I will now proceed to show how he did baptize, by some other passages."

Jane—"But it is proper, before you predicate an argument upon any basis, to be assured of the solidity of the foundation. To my mind, this foundation will give way before your argument will be half complete."

M.—"To my mind, the argument is sound and reasonable. But, since you seem to be so skilled in debate, you might try its strength."

Jane—"It is certain that a Baptist could immerse a greater number, in a given period, than a Presbyterian could sprinkle in the same time. It is the ceremony that takes up the time, and Presbyterian ceremonies are much longer than those found in the Scriptures. Hence, if you were to be successful in your argument, it would involve you more than it would the Baptists.

"And then it is not known that there were three millions of people in the country described. And if there were, still there would not be more than one-fourth of that number baptized, as all that were baptized confessed their sins, showing clearly that none but those who were capable of realizing their condition were baptized. Besides, it is certain that 'all Judea,' etc., does not mean even every adult person. For, first, Christ's apostles baptized some of them. (John iii. 26; iv. 1, 2.) And, second, in Matt. iii. 7-12, we learn that there were some that John thought were not fit to be baptized. Third: In Luke vii. 30 we read, 'But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him.' Hence no more is meant than that a great many from all the places named were baptized. And yet there is no necessity for all this, for there is no reason to suppose that John did all the immersing himself. If Christ bap-

tized by proxy (John iv. 2), so may John have done the same."

M.—"I see that I have two opponents now instead of one. But, in my next visit, I am determined to compel you to admit that there were instances that make it just as clear as can be that there were baptisms and yet no immersion."

And, with these remarks, the investigation closed for another week.

CHAPTER XIX.

BIRTHDAY PARTY—RELIGION AND THE TOOTHACHE—
MANY FRIENDS, AND A FINE VISIT—REV. MR.
HAMPTON TALKS TO JANE ON THE SUBJECT OF RE-
LIGION, AND ARGUES AFFUSION FROM THE EVIDENT
REFERENCES TO CHRISTIAN BAPTISM BY THE TERM
“WASH”—THE VIEW OF SIR JOHN CUGGILL AND
WIFE ON THE CONVERSATION.

The next day but one was Sir John Cuggill's birthday. Of course, James and Jane were present. A great number of friends were present at an early hour. It might have been noticed that all of these friends were Episcopalians. Among others, there was a young Episcopalian clergyman, whose residence was in London, by the name of Hampton. He happened to be on a visit just then, and came with those friends, by special request, to attend the birthday party. All were merry and pleasant except James, who was suffering most intolerably from toothache. He desired a conversation on religion very much; but he could not talk much without great pain, and the minds of the visitors did not seem to be very religiously inclined.

After dinner (which came about 1 o'clock, and lasted for a full hour), as many friends were sitting in the large parlor, Rev. Mr. Hampton came and seated himself beside Jane, and began the conversation on the subject of religion. “Mrs. C., I

learn that you once belonged to 'the church,' but left it to join the Baptists; and also that you are trying to get your husband to do the same! How is this?" Just as he began this conversation, which did not seem to be intended for any one but Jane herself (for he spoke quite low), there was a perfect calm in the house, so that every one in the room heard all that he said. To this Jane replied:

"I once belonged to the Episcopal Church. Indeed, I was raised in it. But when I heard the gospel preached by Baptist ministers I became dissatisfied with the Episcopal Church, and left it by obeying the gospel. But I am not conscious of having made any effort to get my husband to join the Baptists."

Hampton—"You argue the Scriptures with your husband?"

Jane—"You are very much mistaken."

H.—"But you have done so?"

Jane—"Only on the subject of infant baptism, when the question had arisen about baptizing our child."

H.—"Do you not think that you could get to heaven in the Episcopal Church?"

Jane—"Provided I was ignorant of the Lord's will, and had no chance to become acquainted with it."

H.—"You imagine yourself, then, and the few Baptist preachers that are prowling about over the Baptist preachers that are prowling about over the doctors of divinity between this and the apostle Peter!"

Jane—"I was not comparing myself with any one. I have learned what Christ would have me to do, from him and his apostles. My appeal is always to them."

H.—"But, if you knew the character of these Baptist preachers, you would not let one of them come into your house."

Jane—"I do not regulate my life by the failures of men. I know of no religious party that has not its share of hypocrites, even among its preachers, Episcopalians with the rest."

H.—"And they are a set of unlearned bigots. They assume to know everything, and know nothing. I am provoked to see how they can humbug the people."

Jane—"But I have not been governed by the pretensions of any one to learning."

H.—"Did not those preachers tell you that the meaning of *baptizo* was always *to dip*, and unless you were dipped you had no reason to believe you were baptized?"

Jane—"They did preach that. But I knew before that the word always meant *to dip*; only I had supposed that, when used religiously, it might have another meaning. I was convinced by those ministers that, whatever that word meant when used with respect to other things, the Saviour meant the same when he told his apostles to go and baptize the nations."

H.—"But do you not know that words very materially change their meanings? and that, whatever may have been the classic meaning of that

word, it may have a very different meaning in the Scriptures?"

Jane—"I am aware that words sometimes change their meanings, but I am not aware that *baptizo* ever did."

H.—"Well, I think I can show you that a great many words that have a specific meaning, are finally brought to a generic import, so that no definite action can be understood. And, further, that as the specific meaning of *baptizo* was to dip, immerse, immerge, plunge, etc., so it meant, secondarily, to wash, cleanse, purify, etc. And that the Saviour has employed it always in a secondary sense, without any direct reference to any specific action whatever."

Jane—"You might prove that the Saviour used the word in a secondary, consequential meaning, such as stain, tinge, dye, color, and prove thereby that when he sent his apostles into all the world, to baptize the nations, he meant for them to stain, dye or color them."

This remark seemed to be more pleasing to every one else in the room than to Rev. H. They had all been listening eagerly up to that remark, when merriment became uncontrollable for awhile.

As soon as order was restored again, Rev. H. began, in a tone that indicated more energy than humility: "You mean to display wit, I suppose, and thus get rid of my arguments. I hope you will not try to excite laughter on such a subject as this." A man never despises levity so much as when it is at his expense.

Jane—"I was not trying to be witty, but the company had to laugh at the extreme ridiculousness of your position; but, that I may appear sufficiently dignified, I will inquire, Who sent John to baptize? and how did he know what he was to do?"

H.—"We are not now examining John's baptism, but the baptism of Christ in the new covenant."

Jane—"Very well, then, how did the apostles know what the Lord wanted them to do, when he told them to baptize all nations?"

H.—"Well, of course, they had to know what the Saviour meant."

Jane—"And up to that time the word had meant to immerse; now, how would they know that he meant something else?"

H.—"I would rather argue with five theologians than with one woman; they put you always on the proof, and then ask you a hundred questions that Solomon could never answer. But you must remember that the Saviour could easily teach them in what sense he used the word *baptizo*, so that they would know for a certainty and not be in the dark."

Jane—"Certainly. If he had any meaning that he attached to the word other than that which the people attached to it, he not only could, but he would, have told them what particular meaning *baptizo* was intended to have. But have we any evidence that the Saviour did give them any instruction of the kind?"

H.—"I think that the apostles used the word in the sense of wash."

Jane—"And is sprinkling or pouring a mode of washing?"

H.—"More of those questions again! I can say that an entire immersion is not necessary to washing."

Jane—"That is not what I wanted. Would sprinkling or pouring ever be denominated a washing? or could a washing be accomplished by simply sprinkling or pouring?"

H.—"I wished to show you that it is not absolutely certain that the apostles immersed people in order to baptize them."

Jane—"Why not answer my questions?"

H.—"Woman, I can show you Scriptures in which the apostle Paul speaks of, or refers to, baptism by this term 'wash,' that by no means indicate that immersion was thought of."

Jane—"You might read them for our edification."

H.—"I will." And, taking the Bible from the stand, he read from I. Cor. vi. 11: "'But such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.' Again Tit. iii. 5: 'Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' And now, to show you that this washing was with water, and therefore the application of water to the person, rather than

the application of the person in water, I will read Eph. v. 25, 26: 'Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.' Now, I think that these references plainly indicate that Paul understood baptism to be less than an entire immersion."

Jane—"There is one more occurrence that you have not read."

H.—"Give me the reference and I will read it."

Jane—"I refer to Heb. x. 22." Rev. H. turned and read: "Let us draw near with a true heart, in a full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

Jane—"There are a few things connected with this washing that indicate immersion."

H.—"There is nothing that can refer to immersion in these texts."

Jane—" 'But ye are washed' would hardly be said if only a small part of the head or face was intended."

H.—"Persons are many times said to wash, when only the hands or face is understood."

Jane—"That is when a custom has been established, and that custom known to be referred to. But you would have to prove that Christian baptism was performed in that way, before you could know that 'ye are washed' is to have any such limited meaning. But Paul puts the matter to rest

when he says, 'having our bodies washed with pure water. In affusion, this is not true; in immersion, it is true. Hence, when Paul said, having *'our bodies washed with pure water,'* he referred to immersion."

H.—"The apostle Peter says that baptism is the answer of a good conscience toward God. Hence whatever will satisfy the conscience in any given case, will in that case be valid baptism."

Jane—"The conscience will always accept or reject according to the teaching that the person has received, and hence is no guide whatever in deciding questions of this kind, unless it could first be proved that the teaching such person had received was wholly right. But as consciences disagree, all claiming to be right, we know that they must some of them be wrong, unless two ways may be one way; unless two persons traveling in opposite directions may be going the same road! Besides, you take for granted the very thing that is to be proved: that affusion, under any circumstances, may be baptism. That is just what I deny. And now, suppose that you will not be able to find that affusion is baptism at all; then the conscience being answered by baptism, would it be answered by sprinkling or pouring, when neither of these is baptism? In case of your failure to first prove the validity of affusion for baptism, your argument would be: baptism is immersion, the conscience is answered in baptism; therefore, affusion will do for immersion!"

H.—"You are a very fine debater, surely! I had no thought of getting into this long, fruitless argument when I began, or I should have kept still. But I must acknowledge that it is impossible to convince one that is not disposed to be convinced! 'None so blind as those who will not see!'"

Jane—"You ought to have finished the argument by drawing the conclusion, 'Therefore, affusion is the right baptism.'" This again amused the whole company, to the chagrin and exasperation of Rev. H., who leaned back upon his clerical dignity, and remarked: "I was not arguing the question then."

Jane—"Perhaps the same remark might have been made at the conclusion of every sentence that you have uttered."

H.—"I perceive that I can not make you see my arguments."

Jane—"And you might have added: *or any one else.*"

H.—"I do not care to converse further with you on this subject."

Jane—"For obvious reasons: first, you are unable to carry your point; and, second, too full of party pride to yield to the truth."

H.—"I can sustain my position before the company. There are many Scriptures recognizing the doctrine I hold."

Jane—"But you ought to attend to one Scripture at a time. And the last one you referred to you did not even quote."

H.—"I will show you that I can do so." And, turning to the third chapter of I. Peter, he began to read at the eighteenth verse: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ," etc.

Jane—"I would inquire why Peter said baptism was not the putting away of the filth of the flesh."

H.—"I suppose to convince them that it was not immersion, for that would have done that, but the baptism of Peter would not."

Jane—"Peter does not say that it would not put away the filth of the flesh, but that that was not its design, or that was not its purpose. But why did he tell them that it was not for the purpose of putting away the filth of the flesh?"

H.—"Well, I suppose to keep them from imbibing any such false notions."

Jane—"But, if baptism had been performed by affusion, there would have been no need of such a remark. No one would have ever supposed that it was for the purpose of putting away the filth of

the flesh. Baptism was something that might be thus mistaken; affusion would not be thus mistaken; therefore, affusion was not baptism in Peter's day."

Rev. H. rose up and said it was necessary for him to go; he had some letters to write home; and, quite unceremoniously, he and the friends he came with departed. This ended the controversy for that day. But it was plain to be seen that Jane had the sympathy of the company; and she was generally regarded as the champion of the discussion, and that Rev. H. came off second best.

One after another took leave, until Sir John Cuggill and his good wife were left alone. After they had returned again to their parlor, Sir C. said to his wife: "Our daughter-in-law is really a very intelligent lady. I have only just lately begun to appreciate her."

Mrs. Cuggill—"Well, I must confess that she had a great deal the best of the argument to-day. I do not know why the young minister did so poorly; but he certainly is not well posted, or the position of the church on this subject is not right. But, if the church is right, we certainly made a great mistake in sending him to talk to Jane."

Sir C.—"I declare, it seems to me that, in any controversy, Baptist views always prevail. I do not know why it is!"

Mrs. C.—"Suppose we go to James', and hear Rev. M. again. He may do better than this young man did to-day."

CHAPTER XX.

MANY PERSONS BECOMING INTERESTED — PHILIPPIAN
JAILER INTRODUCED—BAPTIZED IN THE JAIL, OR
NOT? OR WHY? — SAUL OF TARSUS—HOUSE OF
JUDAS—STANDING UP—ARISE—PHARPAR, ABANA,
OR WHERE?

Rev. Mr. McCarron was on hand punctually at the time appointed. Several friends and neighbors, having heard of the Scripture investigations, came to hear, and with the rest came also Sir John Cuggill and his wife. He told James that he did not see things just as clearly as he once did, and that he had concluded upon a fair and full review of the whole subject of religion, and hoped that there would be nothing wanting from a thorough investigation.

M.—"Have these friends come to pay a neighborly visit, or to hear our readings?" To which the whole company replied: "To hear the Scriptures."

M.—"I will proceed, then, by introducing the jailer and his household. Now, it seems to me that they must have received baptism some other way than by immersion; for it was performed in the jail where there were no opportunities for an immersion."

James—"A few things ought to be proved. (1) That something else than immersion would have been regarded as baptism. (2) That they were

baptized in the jail. (3) That there *were* not and *could* not be any opportunities for immersion in the jail."

M.—"I want to prove that something else than immersion was the baptism in this case, by showing that an immersion was impossible. And, to say the very least of it, there is no probability that there were opportunities for immersion in the Philippian jail."

James—"If you were to accomplish all you propose to do, it would not prove that sprinkling or pouring water on the head or face is Christian baptism."

M.—"True enough. But, once detached from the necessity of immersion, I can easily settle the rest."

James—"But if they were baptized in the jail, then there is no more than a probability, at least there is no certainty, that there was no tank or fount in which immersion might have been performed. Now, it seems to me that we ought to have something clearer than a probability on a subject of this kind. And, besides, what would be a probability to us would not be a probability to others. And, then, I can not see that the evidence is at all clear that the baptizing took place in the prison."

M.—"It can easily be seen that they were not out of the prison during the night; for in the morning, when the magistrate sent to let them out, they refused to go till the proper authorities would come and bring them out. Now, if they had been

out during the night, then they acted the hypocrite next morning by refusing to go out."

James—"But the jailer's house was not in the prison, was it?"

M.—"I suppose not. But why?"

James—"We do know that they were in the jailer's house. See verse 34 of Acts xvi. Hence, if the jailer's house was not in prison, we do know that they had been out of the prison, account for it as we may."

M.—"But it is quite evident that the baptism took place in the prison."

James—"If it did, then, at best, we can only have a probability on the subject, which comes far short of positive proof. But, in the thirtieth verse, they were brought out; in the thirty-second, they spoke to all that were in the jailer's house; in the thirty-third, the jailer took them; and in the thirty-fourth, he brought them back again. Now, it seems, from all this, that the jailer took them out of the prison into his own house, where they preached to him and his house. Then he took them somewhere else, where baptism could be attended to, and, after that, brought them again into his house."

M.—"There is nothing said about the jailer taking them out of his house to be baptized. It says that he took them and washed their stripes, which only indicates that he washed their stripes, but not that he took them out of doors."

James—"But they were certainly in the jailer's house when they spoke the word of the Lord. And

in verse 34 it says, 'He brought them into his house, and set meat before them.' Now, it is impossible to be brought into a house twice without being taken out once. Therefore, when he took them—verse 33—he took them out of the house; and that, too, as it seems to me, to be baptized; for, certainly, water enough could be had without taking these men *out* to wash their stripes."

M.—"You have a queer way of frittering away my arguments. Perhaps you can find proof of immersion in this case?"

James—"I can not see why these men, who had been whipped and enchained, without anything to eat, in their great weakness should go out, unless it was an absolute necessity. If sprinkling or pouring was baptism, then there would have been no need of their going out. If baptism was immersion, then they would have to go out. Now, it seems that immersion will account for the facts, but affusion will not. Hence, so far as there is proof in the case, it is all in favor of immersion, and against affusion."

M.—"I can't think that Paul and Silas would go very far to baptize the jailer at midnight, hungry and tired and wounded as they were."

James—"What you 'can't think' is one thing, and what Luke says is another matter. We have seen that they certainly did leave the house. How far they went, we do not know. But, wherever they went, it was to find advantages for administering the ordinance that were not to be had in the jailer's house. Of course, they did no more than

was absolutely necessary. If it had not been necessary for them to go out of the house, it is not reasonable that they would have done so. The fact, therefore, that they did go out of the house indicates that the baptism demanded it. Affusion would not demand it; immersion would. Hence the Scripture seems to teach immersion."

M.—"It is not positive, perhaps, and I will say no more about it just now, but call your attention to the baptism of Saul of Tarsus. He was baptized standing up."

James—"That is news. I have lately read the Acts of the Apostles through six times, but did not notice that Saul was baptized standing up. Where is the account?"

M.—"I would like to know first if it will settle the question, or if you will do as you have been doing, deny that it contains any evidence of affusion. You are wont to say, if I prove all I claim, still it will not prove the proposition. Now, I want to know if this will be proof?"

James—"I can not say that it will be at all conclusive. Yet, if Saul was baptized while standing up, it will be evidence of a probable kind. I believe the Greek Church, which, by the way, has always immersed, not unfrequently lets the subject down in a perpendicular manner into the water, while the administrator remains above. But I would hardly suspect such an arrangement in Saul's case."

M.—"I intend to show you that Saul stood up on the floor of the house where he was, and there

received baptism. Now, will that be *positive proof?*”

James—“It will not be positive proof of affusion, but it will be positive proof that he was not immersed.”

M.—“Very well, then. If I can only get you away from this Baptist idea of the necessity of immersion in order to baptism, I will then have no trouble in showing you what the true baptism is.”

James—“Proceed. Let us have the Scripture that says he was baptized while standing on the floor of the house of Judas.”

M.—“In Acts ix. 18 Luke says he ‘arose and was baptized.’ According to chapter xxii. 16, he was told to ‘arise and be baptized.’ Now, the *anistemi* here rendered ‘arose’ and ‘arise,’ means literally ‘stood up,’ ‘stand up.’ The word contains no locomotive power whatever, and hence there is no evidence that he went anywhere else till he was baptized.”

James—“I think that the primary meaning of *anistemi* is ‘arise,’ but whether to remain standing must depend upon some other word; for, surely, being told to arise would not preclude the idea of his going somewhere else after he had arisen. So far, then, from offering proof upon the subject, you have simply found that he was told to arise; and because he was not told to go to Pharpar or Abana, you conclude that he must have stood still! Now, sir, this is falling a great way short of the proposition.”

M.—“When Ananias said to Saul, ‘*Arise and be baptized,*’ the original would give us, ‘*stand up and be baptized,*’ or ‘*standing up,*’ etc. Hence he was to ‘be baptized standing up.’ This, I apprehend, is not ‘falling short of the proposition.’”

James—“I am not as well posted in the Greek of the New Testament as my wife is. I would like to have the benefit of her criticism upon this word.”

Jane—“I find *anistemi* in the Greek New Testament one hundred and eleven times. In our version it is five times ‘stand up,’ three times by other forms equaling that idea, and a hundred and three times, ‘arise,’ ‘arose,’ etc. The noun *anastasis* occurs forty-two times, and is uniformly rendered ‘resurrection,’ or with that signification. Hence, if we gather the meaning of the word entirely without reference to its surroundings, Mr. McCarron has about five chances of being right, in the rendering that he gives, to one hundred and three of being wrong. But when the verb is followed by something that indicates movement, it can hardly be rendered ‘stand up.’ When the Saviour was in the synagogue at Nazareth, it was proper to say that ‘he stood up for to read,’ because in reading he would remain in the same place; but it would not do to say that ‘Mary stood up in those days, and went into the hill country with haste.’ Much less would it do to say ‘she went into the hill country standing up.’ Nor would it do to say to Ananias, ‘Stand up and go into the street called Straight;’ nor to Peter,

'*Stand up*, therefore, and get thee down.' But how ridiculous to say, 'Get thee down *standing up*.' Now, if it could be proved that there was nothing in baptism that would require any change of position after rising, still the other things that he did, such as receiving meat, being certain days with the disciples, and preaching Christ in the synagogues, would demand that the translation should be 'arose,' and not 'stood up.' To prove, therefore, that Saul stood still and was baptized, it must first be proved that baptism could as easily and well be done in that way as any other. And even then the proof would at best only amount to a probability. For if some other way would have done, then, for all this Scripture says, it might have been done some other way. To make it positive proof that he stood still and received baptism, it must first be found that he could not receive it in any other way."

M.—"I began this controversy with Rev. Mr. Bonner, pastor of the Baptist Church, who is a very shrewd critic. Since then I have been conducting it with Mr. Cuggill, who is a much shrewder critic; but I perceive that his wife is the shrewest debater of all."

This remark seemed to please every one, for all seemed ready to award her the victory so far.

Jane—"If you are not able to keep your theory looking respectable, it is because your theology is badly at fault. But it seems to me that Saul's case is decidedly against your position. For he could have received affusion without rising. I

believe that men do not stand up to have water sprinkled or poured upon them. It would be very awkward, especially if the subject should be as tall, or taller, than the administrator. But, to say the very least that can be said, affusion will never account for Ananias telling him to arise. Immersion will account for it; hence it must have been immersion. And, still further, I think Saul—afterwards Paul—tells just all about it—that he was buried by baptism. See Rom. vi. 3, 4.”

M.—“It appears to me that the force of criticism that I have to meet is equal to any emergency. Whatever I may offer, it is but the merest sophistry. I have an argument that has never yet failed, and at our next meeting you may turn against it the host of critics. I shall show how God baptized. And, further, as you have at last referred to your stronghold for dipping, I will prove to you that there is no argument whatever in Rom. vi. 3, 4 for immersion. But I think we have argued this question long enough for one evening.” So saying, he bade them good night, with the promise to renew the effort one week from that evening.

CHAPTER XXI.

REV. MR. M'CARRON'S DIFFICULTIES—SERMON ON BAPTISM—GREAT INTEREST IN THE INVESTIGATION—MRS. JANE CUGGILL—ROM. VI. 3, 4—COL. II. 12—FIGURATIVE? SPIRITUAL? CONTINUOUS? MORAL? OR WHAT?—HOLY SPIRIT BAPTISM (JOEL II. 28-31; ACTS II. AND X.)—ISRAELITES CROSSING THE SEA.

The week was one of anxiety, alike to those that took part in the last conversation, and to those who heard it. But to none was it more so than to Rev. Mr. McCarron. He felt that his arguments in favor of affusion were nearly exhausted; that one or two more interviews would end the investigation; and he was just where he was when they began—not a single point had he sustained. Had the failure been his, or could it possibly be that his theology was at fault? And, then, their readings were becoming painfully public. The number of polite gentlemen and ladies that had witnessed his last embarrassment, and the fact of his signal failure and evident discomfiture at the hands of a woman, who herself once belonged to a church that only practices affusion, weighed down his spirits with anxious grief. But he must take it like a philosopher. He must appear victorious on the outside, however he might feel inwardly. He had one consolation; none of his congregation had been present to witness his consternation. And now he was resolved on the

course to pursue: he should warn his members against the meetings of the Baptists; and preach a sermon on the "*mode* of baptism," and thus prepare himself the better for a last effort. His sermon was a success. Not being announced, and being heard only by those who believed in affusion, it was well received. And he began to feel himself once more "master of the situation." Of course, the arguments that he brought forward were such as had not been employed in their investigations. He had managed these so well in his sermon that he could not see how he should fail on them in the investigation. Still, he thought he should like it better to have none present but the family.

His courage still further gave way when he saw, on arriving at James Cuggill's, that all who had been present the evening before had returned again; still worse, a number of his flock were present who had heard others speak of these meetings, and had come out of the purest curiosity, or to see with what a master's hand their beloved pastor was capable of showing up sprinkling to be the right baptism. But now to present the same arguments that they had heard on the Sunday previous, and have them dissected and ruined, as all his arguments had been before, was entirely too much for ordinary nerves! And he felt still further nonplused when he found that James Cuggill had the toothache, jawache, etc., so that he could not take part in the conversation. He first thought that this would excuse the inter-

view, and he could come some other time when James would be well. But no; he was not to get away so easily! He was informed that Jane would ask whatever questions might be thought necessary. Worse and worse! he thought. He had suffered from the sharp point of her criticism and the keen edge of her logic, and had decided in his own mind that she was the most formidable opponent that he had ever met. And still there was no escape. Although it was almost regarded a crime for any one, especially a woman, to undertake to argue Scripture with a preacher, still he felt that no contempt could be excited for *her*, for she was too well known, and too highly respected, to be made the subject of ridicule.

Now, it is but just to say for Jane, that she was a lady of very inoffensive manners. She never engaged in any controversy whatever except as a matter of duty, and then around all her criticism there was thrown a womanly gentleness and a womanly integrity that could not fail to add a charm to all that she said. Though she sometimes indulged in withering sarcasm, yet it was to her an apparent duty, in order to reveal the hiding-place of an opponent. She had enjoyed fine opportunities. Her education was as good as the country afforded; and since her marriage she had been reading constantly. Her mind was, therefore, well disciplined to criticism.

All the friends present seemed anxious to have the investigation begin, and so expressed themselves.

Rev. M. thought he had better have the argument for immersion brought forward first, and then close the evening's interview with his best argument for sprinkling. So he said, "We might as well begin with your argument for immersion. So you may proceed."

Jane—"I only referred to Rom. vi. 3, 4, as Paul's statement upon the subject of his baptism. I have no argument upon it that I know of. I rely simply upon what he says."

M.—"Well, what does he say that favors immersion?"

Jane—"I will read the passage. 'Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.' Now, it is impossible to be buried by baptism and not be immersed."

M.—"But this language is figurative, and therefore proves nothing pertinent to the subject."

Jane—"Figurative language always tells of facts that gave rise to the figure. Hence, if this language is figurative, we ask then what is the fact upon which the figure is predicated?"

M.—"The fact that we are dead, and our life is hid with Christ in God."

Jane—"That is quite as figurative as the other. Please give us the fact. Is it that, in being baptized, we were sprinkled? or that we were immersed?"

M.—"Neither the one nor the other. Paul never makes the slightest reference to the mode of baptism in the passage. He simply refreshes their minds; that, whereas they were once sinners, they had now undertaken to serve the Lord; that they were not of the world, that they should heed its lusts; that when they were baptized, they had agreed to forsake the world and follow Christ. Now, this is the fact. Paul presents it in a style highly figurative, such as being baptized into Christ's death. And now, to show you certainly that he had no reference to the mode of baptism, I have but to remind you where Christ's death took place; and you know that there can be no likeness between an immersion and death upon the cross. And being buried by baptism refers simply to the same fact, that at their baptism their former life was put entirely out of sight, as though it were buried."

Jane—"But in baptism, they had not only been buried, but risen again. And if being buried with Christ meant agreeing to forsake sins, what did their resurrection mean?"

M.—"The meaning is simply this: in baptism, they as sinners were dead, and put as thoroughly out of sight as though they were buried. But then they were to live a new life, which he presents by a resurrection from the dead, so that a Christian is both dead and alive: dead to the world, and alive to God; his former life put out of sight, as if buried, and yet living by the faith of the Son of God.' And this meaning is all the

more certainly correct, from the tense of the verb 'are.' 'We *are* buried.' The burial is therefore continuous, ever present. It can not, therefore, refer to a burial in water, else they were all under the water when Paul was writing the letter."

Jane—"But if the last clause refers to the resurrection, or their rising to walk in a new life, as you allow, then we notice that the same that were buried were raised again. So, if it was their old man that was buried, it was their old man that was raised again! And you are certainly mistaken in your criticism on the verb 'are.' Now, that word, to say the least of it, may be rendered 'were'; and yet it is not necessary, for where the tense is clearly known, the present may be used. But, whatever the rendering of the word, the sense is clearly in the past. Just notice: 'So many of us as *were*' baptized into Jesus Christ, *were* baptized into his death.

"This matter of baptism, then, was not continued, but was clearly a thing of the past. Hence, whatever there was in this being 'buried by baptism,' it was something that had had a *bona-fide* existence as a matter of their past history. And, further, I think that the whole thread of your criticism is wrong. Paul had been proving to them that 'where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.' Hence Paul anticipates some one as asking this question: 'Will it not be better, then, for us to 'continue in sin, that grace may abound'? To which he would say, 'By no means.' Why? He would say that the very manner of your putting

on Christ, who died and rose again for our justification, indicates that we have died and been buried from our former life, and have arisen to walk in a new one. 'This burial did not take place in the new tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, but in baptism.' Thus, as Christ had died for our sins, and was buried and raised again for our justification, so we, in accepting him as our Leader, our Prophet, Priest and King, have died to our sins, have been buried with him by baptism, and have arisen to walk in a new life. How inconsistent, then, to talk of continuing in sin, that grace might abound ! This seems to be the argument of Paul. Now, could Paul say to a congregation of Presbyterians, not one of whom had been immersed, '*We are buried by baptism*'?"

M.—"You must remember that I do not deny that immersion is baptism, and it is barely possible that Paul may have referred to that mode of baptism; but I have given a great deal of study upon this passage, and I have concluded that the apostle does not refer to any mode whatever."

Jane—"The apostles did not speak or write of the mode of baptism, but they spoke of baptism in such a way that they revealed clearly what they knew it to be. Such a reference is the one that we are considering. Paul had not been to Rome, and could only know what was true in their baptism by the fact that the same things were true in every case of baptism. Hence, when Paul refreshed their minds with the fact that

they had been buried by baptism, he only did so because he knew that, when persons were baptized into Christ, they 'were buried by baptism.' "

M.—"If this baptism was a literal burial in water, as the Saviour was buried in the tomb of Joseph, then they would have to remain three days under water!"

Jane—"Paul does not attempt any figure of the kind. He simply shows them the impropriety of continuing in sin, by the form of doctrine which they obeyed (see the seventeenth verse), which was, according to Paul in I. Cor. xv. 1, 4 and Rom. vi. 3, 4, that Christ died, was buried, and rose again. This was the doctrine; and the form which they obeyed was, therefore, a death, a burial and a resurrection. This form of doctrine they obeyed by dying to their sins, being buried by baptism, and rising to walk in a new life. No reference is made to the time of the burial or how long they remained in a burial state, but simply to the fact that they were buried."

M.—"But you constantly speak of a resurrection in this case of baptism. Where do you find it?"

Jane—"I think it is very clearly referred to in the fourth verse; but, to save any time on that part of it, I refer to a parallel passage, Col. ii. 12, which reads: 'Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.' Here it is clearly stated that they were

buried with Christ and also risen with him; and both had been accomplished in baptism."

M.—"This is certainly Holy Ghost baptism; for in water baptism persons are raised by the administrator, but here they are raised by the power of faith."

Jane—"It does not say that they were raised by the power of faith. And, if it did, it would not prove it to be Holy Spirit baptism. But, even if it was Holy Spirit baptism, it does not change the fact of its being a burial. However, therefore, you may arrange it, you must at least find that it was a burial. Not only buried, but risen again, which proves it no Spirit baptism; for in that we are not buried to be raised out again. But Paul says that they were buried in baptism; not only so, but buried with Christ; not only buried with him, but also risen with him; not literally in the tomb of Joseph, but in baptism. But the question would arise, How are they then buried and risen with Christ? Paul's reply would be: 'Through the faith of the operation of God, that raised him from the dead.' By this faith the subject is connected with Christ, so that, in his burial and resurrection, Paul could say with propriety that he was buried and risen with God."

M.—"I do not care a fig how many Scriptures you may be able to find, referring to baptism by the mode of immersion; if I shall find you one Scripture that proves it to have been done by sprinkling or pouring, it will be sufficient to show that affusion may now be recognized as baptism."

Jane—"If? But we are not looking for a mode of baptism, but to find what baptism is; what the Saviour commanded the apostles to do when he sent them to baptize the nations; and what the apostles did when they baptized. So far, the evidence from the lexicons, and King James' translators, and from all the occurrences of the Word, either in the Septuagint Scriptures or in the New Testament, is, that the Saviour told his apostles to go and immerse the people, and that, when they baptized the people, they did immerse them."

M.—"But I want to show you, not how men baptized, but how God baptized; and, for this purpose, I refer to the baptism of the Holy Ghost. For this purpose, I refer to Joel ii. 28-31, 'I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh,' etc. Just before the Saviour ascended into heaven, he said to his apostles, 'For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence' (Acts i. 5). Now read Acts ii. 2-4: 'And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.' Now read verses 16, 17: 'But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh,' etc. My next reference is Acts x. 44: 'While Peter yet

spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word.' Peter recounts it in chapter xi., and says, verses 15, 16, 'And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.'

"Now, from these Scriptures, the following facts must be found: 1. God promised to 'pour out his Spirit upon all flesh.' 2. The Holy Ghost was 'poured out,' 'shed forth,' 'fell on them.' 3. This was the fulfillment of the Saviour's promise that they should be baptized. Or, 1. God baptized by pouring. 2. What he did is a guide to us with respect to mode. 3. The conclusion, we may baptize by pouring."

Jane—"But, if you succeed in this, it will not prove sprinkling for baptism, will it?"

M.—"We may attend to that afterward. I am not disposed to delay my victory from this Scripture. No Baptist will ever be able to resist the force of these Scriptures, or the deductions that I draw from them. I wish you to test the strength of them."

Jane—"What is it that Christ and Peter called baptism?"

M.—"The pouring out of the Holy Ghost."

Jane—"Was the Holy Spirit literally poured out—the third person in the Trinity literally poured—like water or oil? Or is the language highly figurative?"

M.—"Peter quoted the promise of God, that he would pour out his Holy Spirit, and applied it to the Spirit's demonstration on the day of Pentecost. Hence something occurred that day that would be denominated pouring out of the Holy Spirit. And, therefore, whether we say that the Spirit was literally poured out or not, the result is the same; all we know of it is the idea of pouring, and it is called baptism."

Jane—"I would like an answer to my question: was the Holy Spirit literally poured out? Answer yes or no."

M.—"I shall follow my own liking with reference to the manner of answering questions. But why do you not deal with my argument?"

Jane—"I wish to know what your argument is. If it is founded upon the literal pouring out of the Holy Spirit, then I will deal with it. But if it is based upon some other fact, of which this is only a figurative expression, it may answer itself. Hence I insist that you tell us if you think that the Holy Spirit was literally poured out or not."

M.—"Well, I suppose that it was not literally poured out, as we pour oil or water."

Jane—"Upon what, then, is your argument based? What fact is presented by that figure?"

M.—"I wish you would answer my argument if you can, and not keep us all so long in suspense."

Jane—"I can not tell what your argument is. First you made an argument as though you be-

lieved in the literal outpouring of the Spirit of God; but now you say that you do not believe that it was thus literally poured out. Where, therefore, is your argument? Something was done on the day of Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius, that was called the baptism of the Holy Spirit; but the question is, what was that something? You say it was not the literal pouring out of the Spirit. Now, what was it?"

M.—"I see that you want to fritter away the meaning of this, my strongest argument. I therefore will assume a literal outpouring of the Holy Spirit."

Jane—"But why do you do this, thus contradicting yourself? How many times is it necessary for a doctor of divinity to contradict himself in order to get one argument for pouring? But now, since we have McCarron versus McCarron, I propose to show that McCarron is also opposed to the apostle Peter."

M.—"I hope you will use more delicate and respectful language."

Jane—"Perhaps I went beyond proper limits; but I will be delicate!"

M.—"I can not converse further, unless you can exhibit a proper respect."

Jane—"I would not offend you for anything. For, if I should, I might regret it all my life. I will exhibit respect! Only muster your courage, and take your final defeat like a man. Please do not play mad, to get off without a full investigation. Stay, Doctor, do n't run yet!"

These were home thrusts and amused the spectators very much. For it appeared to every one that Rev. M. was only looking for an apology for leaving.

M.—“It is now time to close the evening’s interview, and I have no doubt that the people all want to retire.”

Sir John Cuggill—“For my part, I am very highly entertained, and hope that the examination will be continued, till we may know if there is one Scripture that favors affusion; for I am beginning to doubt it.”

This was like a clap of thunder from a clear sky. None were more surprised than James and Jane. One after another said “Go on,” “go on,” till it was evident that the entire assembly was in favor of having the investigation continued. Jane was much encouraged. She felt that those who had been her most bitter enemies were beginning to appreciate her. She had seen evidences, of late, that the father and mother of her husband had come to regard her more favorably than ever before.

Jane—“Well, if the Holy Spirit was literally poured, and pouring was the baptism, then it was the Holy Spirit that was baptized and not the apostles. Or I may present it in this way: 1. That which was poured was baptized. 2. The Holy Spirit was poured. 3. Therefore, the Holy Spirit was baptized. And the other side may be presented thus: 1. That which was not poured was not baptized. 2. The apostles were not

poured. 3. Therefore, the apostles were not baptized! But we learn from the Saviour and the apostle Peter that they were baptized. Hence your position is in irreconcilable antagonism to the Saviour and Peter!"

M.—"I want you to answer me one question: is not the pouring out of the Spirit called the baptism of the Spirit?"

Jane—"Not by Christ or one of the apostles."

M.—"Then I would like to know what was the baptism?"

Jane—"The manner of the Spirit's descent is never spoken of as the baptism. If it were, we might have some new theology. For instance, in John xiv. 26 the Saviour says: 'Whom the Father will send in my name.' You see what a splendid argument might be made from this: 1. The Holy Spirit was sent. 2. At which time there was a baptism of the Spirit. 3. Therefore, sending is baptizing! But, in John xv. 26, the Saviour says: 'But when he, the Spirit, is come.' Now we can have another syllogism: 1. The Holy Spirit came. 2. Then there was a baptism. 3. Therefore, to come is to baptize. That the weakness of these syllogisms is not greater than the one forming your argument, may be seen by the fact that, where the prophet Joel speaks, in language highly figurative, of the Holy Spirit being poured out, the Saviour, speaking of the same event, says: 'When he, the Holy Spirit, is come.' It could therefore as reasonably be argued that coming is as truly a baptism as pouring is, and even more so, for the

Saviour spoke far more literally than did the prophet."

M.—"You think, then, that the Spirit was not poured out at all."

Jane—"Not literally."

M.—"Then you contradict Peter, who quoted Joel's prophecy and applied it to the day of Pentecost, or to what occurred at that time."

Jane—"Peter does not declare that Joel's language was literal. And I say it was not literal. Who can see the disagreement? But let us see what it was that Peter referred to on that occasion. 1. They heard a sound as of a rushing mighty wind. 2. It filled all the house. 3. There were tongues distributed to each, and sat upon their heads. 4. They were all filled with the Holy Spirit. 5. They spake as the Spirit gave them utterance. 6. And the people were all amazed and marveled, saying, 'Are not all these Galileans who speak unto us? and how hear we every man in our own tongue wherein we were born?' 7. But others mocked, and said, 'These men are full of new wine.' 8. But Peter said, 'These are not drunken, as you suppose. But this is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel,' etc. *This what?* What the people said was the effect of being full of sweet wine. Peter says, '*This power* by which they speak is that which was spoken of.' Hence Peter knew that when Joel spoke of pouring out of the Holy Spirit, the manner of its descent was in no way referred to, but the reference was solely to its effects after it

should come. This, if possible, is still further evident by the form of words that follow. With a literal translation, it would read: '*I will pour out from my Spirit,*' etc. Hence, in Acts xi. 17, when Peter had narrated what God had done at the house of Cornelius, he says, 'What was I that I could withstand God, seeing that he gave them the like gift that he did unto us?' And this being overwhelmed in the Spirit, or, in other words, immersed in the Spirit, and put entirely under its control, was what reminded Peter of the Saviour's promise of Holy Spirit baptism."

M.—"You seem to be capable of finding immersion in the clearest record of pouring. Perhaps you can find an immersion on dry ground. At any rate, I would like to see how you would succeed with the passage of the children of Israel through the Red Sea. They passed over as by dry land, which they could not have done if they had been immersed. The Egyptians that essayed to follow them were immersed, but never got out. The hosts of Israel were baptized, but not immersed."

Jane—"Were the children of Israel sprinkled or poured upon?"

M.—"I am not looking for affusion. I only asked if you could find any immersion in that case?"

Jane—"This would be an unnecessary work. If baptism is spoken of a hundred times in a way not revealing its action, and yet used once in a way giving the meaning to be clearly that of im-

mersion, we must decide its action to be immersion, unless there is some counter testimony. But, so far, we have been taught, in every possible manner, the exact meaning of the word to be immersion, but not a single teaching in favor of sprinkling or pouring. If, then, you have nothing in this passage favoring affusion, it seems entirely unnecessary for me to show that it means immersion."

Sir John C.—"I would like to have the passage read."

M.—"I will read it. 'Moreover, brethren, I would not that you should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea.' Now, in Heb. xi. 29, we learn that they passed over 'as by dry land.' Now, I submit that Paul could not have made that remark if they had been immersed; hence that there is certainly one case of baptism without an immersion."

Jane—"Could Paul have called the passage through the sea a baptism, knowing that baptism was an affusion? If not, then, so far, you are unable to appropriate the text!"

M.—"I am satisfied to know that one baptism took place where we know that there was no immersion."

Jane—"I am not disposed to let you away from the passage so easily. Though you can not be provoked to try to show anything like sprinkling or pouring in it, I propose to show you that the idea

of immersion is all that could have justified the employment of such a figure."

Rev. M. yawned, and said he was tired of such a fruitless controversy, and he was not disposed to remain longer. He thought it was time that all nice people should be at home. So saying, he took his hat and retired, muttering something about the waste of time in listening to a woman's talk; and that the Baptists ought to dub Jane—Dr. Jane Cuggill! James followed him, inquiring if he would not call again and finish the investigation on the action of baptism. But he received no answer. The whole company then agreed to come together in a week, to further examine the question. Thus the meeting ended.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE INQUIRY—THE PASSAGE THROUGH THE SEA—THE CLOUD A PILLAR—DID IT RAIN?—BAPTISM AN EMBLEM OF PURIFICATION; OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST AND HIS RESURRECTION—MEANING OF I. COR. XV. 30, ETC.—BAPTIZED FOR THE DEAD—IF SPRINKLING THOUGHT TO BE RIGHT, IS IT RIGHT?

The intervening time was full, as usual, of interest and inquiry. Even the members of the Presbyterian Church were busily engaged in reading up the Scriptures on the subject. A number of Episcopalians had also become interested in the question. Sir John Cuggill had nearly lost faith in affusion, and had so expressed himself in the presence of a great many of his intimate friends who were staunch Churchmen. The people were alive with excitement. Jane was seriously discussed, by the friends and enemies of her religion. By some she was regarded as an incarnate demon; by others, an angel of the first rank. But, whatever they thought of her holding an argument with a clergyman, which was regarded by the "straitest sect" as a great want of womanly prudence, the house of James Cuggill, on the appointed evening, was crowded to its utmost capacity. All seemed anxiously inquiring into the truth.

A Mr. Barnes, who was a member of the Episcopal Church, began the conversation, by asking Jane to continue the reading from where it was

left off the previous evening. In this request, all that were present heartily concurred. Even James' father and mother, who were present again, appeared anxious to have Jane begin the examination.

Jane—"I promised to show Rev. M. that his conclusions were erroneous. And, although I can not show him, I will try to show you.

"In the first place, if baptism, in the days of Paul, had been sprinkling or pouring, he could not have called the passage through the sea a baptism, for it is evident that they were neither sprinkled nor poured. In the second place, if baptism had been immersion, then Paul would have been justified in calling what transpired there a baptism. Or we may sum it up this way: 1. Paul has before him a case of immersion, and not affusion. 2. He calls it a baptism. 3. Hence baptism was immersion, according to Paul."

Mr. Barnes—"Do you think, then, that an immersion may obtain, and yet the person immersed not be wet—not even a drop of water put on him? If that is the idea of the Baptists, I might be induced to join them."

Jane—"A man may be immersed in law, in politics, in debt, in fire, in the Holy Spirit. And while it would be a clear case of immersion, there would not be a drop of water in it. Hence, whether the immersed will be wet, depends on the element."

B.—"But may a person receive Christian baptism and not be wet?"

Jane—"I think not, for the element of Christian baptism is water. But the baptism of the Israelites was not Christian baptism, nor was the element water."

B.—"What was the element?"

Jane—"The cloud and the sea."

B.—"But the cloud was only a pillar, and stood behind them, hence not a covering."

Jane—"It was not only a pillar, but much more, for it hid the Israelites from the Egyptians; and the rear of their camp must have been several miles wide. But Paul settles the question, and calls it a cloud. Not only so, but says of the fathers that they were *under it*. Hence, if Paul is reliable, while they were hemmed in by walls made from the waters of the sea, and covered by the cloud, there was a complete overwhelming in these two elements. Hence an immersion, but not an affusion."

Sir J. C.—"But may not the cloud have sprinkled water upon them?"

Jane—"Certainly not. It was not a rain cloud, but a cloud of darkness to the Egyptians and of light to the Israelites. Or, on the one side it was darkness, and on the other it was light. This seems to be the same cloud that afterward came down and covered the tabernacle, 'and the glory of the Lord filled the place.'"

B.—"But there seems to me to be more significance in sprinkling or pouring than in immersion; for, as baptism is an emblem of purification which must be accomplished by the Holy Spirit, it could

only be significant by representing the manner of the Spirit's operation."

Jane—"You take everything for granted. None of the things of which you speak are true. 1. Baptism is never said to be an emblem of purification. 2. Purification from sin is attributed to the blood of Christ, and not to the Holy Spirit. 3. There is no evidence that any operation of the Spirit upon the human heart may be represented by sprinkling or pouring. But what is presented to us in baptism is the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. This we have already seen in the passages in Romans and Colossians. 'Baptized into his death,' 'buried with him in baptism,' etc., are quite clear. Also, to the Corinthians, Paul teaches the same lesson, or refers to the well-known fact of what I have said. See I. Corinthians xv.: 'Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?'"

B.—"If baptism presents to us the death of Christ, then we have two ordinances in the church for the same purpose. The Lord's Supper is especially said to be for that purpose. How will you get along with that?"

Jane—"Nearly all the ordinances and forms that God has ever required men to keep, have pointed to the death of Christ, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, if baptism and the Supper had the same import, it would only be in keeping with what God meant in requiring the thirty-one sacrifices that took place under the law. But

while the Lord's Supper represents to us the body broken and the 'blood shed for many for the remission of sins,' baptism not only brings before us the fact that He died, but that he was buried, and rose again. And, still further, if baptism is not for the purpose of reminding us of the burial and resurrection of the Saviour, then there is no ordinance given that certainly, and by appropriate form, bears that thought. Since, then, Paul has declared that it bears that import, we might as well acknowledge it."

B.—"The last Scripture that you referred to, I think, is of very doubtful import. Commentators have not been agreed with respect to its meaning. We can not, therefore, be sufficiently certain of the correctness of any interpretation to make this text take any profitable part in an investigation of this kind."

Jane—"The meaning of the passage is clear to my mind. Paul was meeting the position of some that said there was no resurrection of the dead. This he did in several ways. 1. If so, then Christ had not risen. 2. The apostles were false witnesses. 3. Their faith was in vain. 4. They were yet in their sins. 5. Those that had died had perished. 6. They should eat, drink and be merry, and not be in jeopardy every hour. 7. They had been baptized for the dead! That is, these things were so if there was no resurrection. But if there was a resurrection, the reverse would be true. Now, it appears to me that Paul could not and would not have made such a refer-

ence to baptism, except its import was generally known and commonly acknowledged to represent faith in the death, burial and resurrection of Christ."

B.—"You seem to be successful in argument; but suppose some one should honestly suppose that affusion is the right baptism, would it not be right for such a person to receive it in that way?"

Jane—"Paul says there is 'one baptism.' Hence, unless man will receive that which God has required of him, known by that term, then he is not baptized at all. How far, and under what circumstances, God may excuse ignorance of that kind, belongs unto the Lord and not unto us. But certain I am that, unless a man is immersed, he is not baptized."

To this last remark no reply was made. All were silent for some time. Finally the silence was broken by some gentleman remarking that he understood that Rev. Mr. Bonner, the Baptist preacher, was going to immerse several persons the next day in a stream of water near Cardigan. One after another declared the intention of being present, until nearly all had agreed to go and see persons immersed—buried in baptism. And finally the company dispersed without making any definite arrangements for the future, except to attend the immersion on the day following.

CHAPTER XXIII.

JAMES' SLEEPLESSNESS AND FINAL DETERMINATION—
GREAT INTEREST IN THE BAPTISM—THE SCENE—
JAMES DEMANDS BAPTISM, AND IS REFUSED—GREAT
EXCITEMENT—CLOUD, SATISFACTION—DINING AT
SIR GEORGE FREEMAN'S—REV. MR. BONNER—RE-
GENERATION, BORN OF WATER—HEREDITARY TOTAL
DEPRAVITY—WHOM THE BAPTIST CHURCH RECEIVES.

James was unusually meditative that night. He could then look back over the last few years, and realize how the stream of life had been sweetened with health and matrimonial blessedness, and yet how its waters had been disturbed, and, at times, been made to almost overflow its banks, by religious controversy. He had seen many anxious days while he was seeking everywhere, and in every way, and by any hand that offered assistance, first, to find Scriptural authority for baptizing his child, and then, when he failed in that, to find the truth of God with respect to his own condition. And, through all this sunshine and shadow, he could not fail to recognize the benevolent hand of a gracious Providence. The circumstances of his life had conduced to the understanding of the Scriptures to which he had then attained. He had thus been led to consider the authority for infant baptism, and to know that it is of the fathers, and not of God; of tradition, and not of Scripture. Not only so, but he had been

led to know that affusion is not baptism. At least, so he thought. For their examination had been full and free on the action of baptism, except the classic use of the word *baptizo*, which, so far as he knew, or had ever heard of, was in favor of immersion, and against affusion. He had seen many concessions made by those eminent divines who practiced affusion, to the effect that no historian, orator or biographer had used the word *baptizo* in the sense of sprinkle or pour. Hence this question was settled. But, now (for conscience must play its part), what was his duty in the premises? This was the question that drove sleep from his eyes.

Finally, James concluded to be immersed the next day by Rev. Mr. Bonner. When they should all go to witness the immersion that was to take place, he would go forward and ask to be baptized. Having learned his duty in this respect, he was determined to render that obedience to the Lord which had been revealed to him in the Word.

We must realize, now, that James had studied the Scriptures very closely for two years. He had read the New Testament through, in course, some six or seven times, besides his special readings on the subject and action of baptism. This accounts for his recent familiarity with the Scriptures, compared with his great lack of such intelligence when first he began to look for authority for infant baptism.

The meetings at his house had attracted very much attention. To many, such things appeared

to be nothing but religious fanaticism. And, of course, Jane was regarded as the fanatic. How Rev. Mr. Bonner felt, or what he thought of not being allowed to visit one of his flock, especially to speak in the presence of James on the action of baptism, while the Presbyterian preacher had continued to argue the question before him, we do not know. Perhaps he and the Baptist Church in Cardigan were not ignorant of the change that religious affairs were taking in the Cuggill family. Much prayerful solicitude had been felt, and many entreaties had been made before the throne of Him who rules and presides over the destinies of men, that all attending those meetings might be brought to the knowledge of the truth.

A great number of persons were at the beautiful stream, just on the outside of Cardigan, to witness the immersion. Some, perhaps, hoped to see something that would make immersion disgraceful, and render it offensive; some were mere idle curiosity-seekers, who had come to see what was done, but having no real religious convictions whatever. More than a hundred staunch church-members were present to witness, with thanksgiving and joyfulness, obedience to their Master. There were the penitent believers, in readiness to be buried with their Lord in baptism. Here were many, no doubt, almost persuaded to be Christians, if only they knew how to be. Here the Cuggills and Freemans met on more friendly terms than they had since the return of James and Jane from America.

Though the ceremonies were not pompous, even as the sprinkling of water on an infant's face in an Episcopal chapel, yet the very humility of this religious people was solemnly grand. Their songs may have been wanting somewhat in taste and artistic execution, but they sang with that soul and zeal and fervency that was then peculiar to Welsh Baptists. Whether or not they sang with the understanding, at least they sang with the spirit.

An appropriate prayer was offered, and then Rev. Mr. Bonner, descending into the stream to a proper depth, with a candidate, after pronouncing the baptismal formula, plunged the candidate beneath the yielding wave and raised him up again. And this was repeated until nine persons, four gentlemen and five ladies, had been planted in the likeness of Christ's death, and raised in the likeness of his resurrection.

When the last of those candidates had been immersed, James Cuggill stood on the brink of the stream as the preacher was coming out of the water. All eyes, for the time, were fixed on James. "What is he about to do?" was probably the silent interrogatory of more than two hundred hearts. But he was too much in earnest to be aware of the attention that he was attracting; and, if he had known, it would have made no difference with him whatever.

The crowd of people upon the bank, almost insensible of their action, pressed down to the water's edge, as if they would prevent the possibility of failing to see and hear what was about to be

transacted. James addressed the preacher in a tone somewhat tremulous: "See, here is water; what hinders me to be baptized?" This was entirely unexpected by every one present but himself. The preacher seemed to be taken entirely by surprise, and knew not what to say. He was almost ready to follow out the example brought to his mind by the question propounded; but he had never known anything of the kind in the history of the Baptist Church. He finally gained possession of his mind, and said, "Have you an experimental knowledge of the pardon of your sins?"

James—"No, sir."

B.—"The church ought to hear your experience first. If you choose, you may relate it now."

James—"It is obedience to Christ that I want to render."

B.—"But the church must first decide if you are prepared to be baptized."

James—"I know more of this than any one else upon the earth. I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God; and, in obedience to him, I want to be baptized."

B.—"I have no doubt that you are in earnest in the matter. But, unless you can satisfy the church that you are a child of God, they will not receive you."

James—"I am not asking the church to receive me, but asking to be baptized, in obedience to Christ."

Rev. Mr. Bonner, seeing that nothing was likely to be gained by protracting the controversy

further, and fearing that the impression that had been gained in favor of the truth might be lost, dismissed the audience by pronouncing the benediction, and, without further ceremony, departed for the nearest convenient place to change his raiment.

James and Jane and his father and mother went to Mr. Freeman's (Jane's father), to spend the rest of the day. This was the first time Sir John Cuggill had entered the house of George Freeman since he had gone there to lecture Jane against being immersed into the Baptist Church. There was but little said. All were deeply impressed with the religious services which they had witnessed. And still a cloud of darkness covered the moral heavens. James had presented himself for baptism, greatly to the satisfaction of his wife and her people. Nor was this act at all displeasing to his father; for, though he had been a staunch Episcopalian, and had held to "*the church*" with a devotion that was blind, he had loosed his hand on unscriptural practices, and had already been convinced that there was no authority for infant baptism, and that, unless he should be immersed, he would never have been baptized. He had come to this conclusion with less than a tenth part of the investigation which James had given the same subject.

Jane did not venture to speak to James concerning the disappointment. Still, she hoped and prayed that things would take a turn, and that all would be right.

After dinner, and when all had returned to the parlor, James began the conversation by addressing Mr. Freeman as follows: "Did I commit some serious blunder to-day? or why was I refused the privilege of being baptized?"

F.—"I do not know that you did commit any blunder, and yet it was out of the usual order. Your demand was the same that was made by the cunuch. But, in that case, there was no church present to be satisfied as to the candidate's fitness for the ordinance. This difference of circumstances may account for the difference of reply from that made by Philip."

James—"But if Philip demanded no more of a candidate than I offered to give, then neither Rev. Mr. Bonner nor the Baptist Church has a right to ask more. But this effort to make the responsibility of such things rest upon the members of the church is all a mistake. Church-members will require no more and no less than their religious guides have taught them to require. And while I acknowledge myself indebted to Rev. B. for knowing what baptism is, I am sure that his action to-day was not in harmony with the word of God."

Just then Rev. Mr. Bonner was announced at the door, and, soon after, was seated in the parlor. Evidences of chagrin and disappointment could be traced in his countenance. He had evidently followed up, to fix matters a little. So James thought, and hence remarked: "I think that you have the right view of the action of bap-

tism, but you certainly demand more of candidates in order to baptism than any inspired man ever did. I would like to have you reconcile your practice in this respect with the teachings of the word of God."

B.—"We believe that regeneration must precede baptism; and I have no doubt that you would have given satisfactory evidences of new life in Christ, if only you had related your experience."

James—"I am not sure that I know what you mean. If you mean by regeneration, the remission of sins, as you seemed to to-day, then I am not regenerated. If you mean faith in Christ and a determination to do his will, then I am; and I so expressed myself when I demanded baptism."

B.—"You do not get the meaning of the word. To do so, we must realize man's condition without it. He is dead in sins. Now, a dead man can not bring himself to life. The new life must be imparted by another and higher power. Now, as Paul uses this figure of death to illustrate the condition of the sinner, we come to realize the helplessness of the sinner till the Holy Spirit is sent into his heart to regenerate him, take away his former perverseness and depravity, and make him a child of God."

James—"Your theory is in great confusion, or I am as dead to all common sense as your theory makes the sinner to the things of God. You have man's depravity, independent operation of the

Holy Spirit, pardon of sins, etc., all mixed up. Suppose we take one at a time, and see how far, according to your idea, I have advanced."

B.—"You will admit what I said about hereditary depravity, will you not?"

James—"I have not heard you say anything about hereditary depravity before. What do you mean by it?"

B.—"By Adam's sin all men have been made sinners. He begat children in his own spiritual condition, and thus men are totally corrupt, and incapable, in a state of nature, of doing anything that is truly good. In this state of helplessness man remains till the Holy Spirit changes his spiritual life-forces into an opposite direction. When the Holy Spirit does thus remove this total inclination to all evil, the man is regenerated or born again."

James—"Being dead in trespasses and in sins is a long way from total depravity, say nothing of hereditary total depravity. Sin is not something that grows on the inside or the outside of the man, but an omission of duty, or a transgression of law. This being so, it is impossible for sin to be transmitted from parent to son. An act may not be transmitted, its consequences may. But these Ephesians were dead in *sins* and *trespasses*—not in the consequences of what some one else had done, but what they had done themselves. Now, this is my condition; I am a sinner—not worse, perhaps, than those who asked Peter on the day of Pentecost what they must do to be saved, and

who were told by that inspired servant of God how they might have their sins remitted."

B.—"I see that you have not been born again."

James—"That is just the difficulty; but I want to be."

B.—"This must be the work of the Holy Ghost."

James—"I must be born of water and the Spirit, as stated in John iii. 5."

B.—"You make 'born of water' refer to baptism, but it had no such meaning; water therefore refers to Spirit, which, in regenerating the human heart, is as incomprehensible as the blowing of the wind, referred to in verse 8."

James—"If the Saviour means Spirit when he says 'water,' he may have meant water when he said 'Spirit'! But he surely would not have said 'born of the Spirit, and of the Spirit'! And now, I submit that, if the Saviour does not mean what he says, there is no telling what he means."

B.—"But such an interpretation as you would give to the phrase 'born of water' would make baptism a saving ordinance, and allow that man may save himself by works!"

James—"No interpretation about it. The Lord said, 'born of water.' Now, when he said 'water,' he intended to be understood as meaning just what he said, or as meaning something else! If he meant something else, how can we know what he meant?"

B.—"My objection to the interpretation is not removed: making baptism a saving ordinance."

James—"Your objections may take care of themselves, for all the interest I have in them. I have been accustomed to men interpreting the Lord's words in the light of their likes and dislikes, till human objections have but very little force with me. If the Saviour's words and your objections can not be made to harmonize, your objections must get out of the way."

B.—"But this is figurative language, and it will not do to interpret any figure of speech in the Scriptures so as to contradict any clear and literal statements."

James—"I know of no literal language of the Saviour or of any of the apostles that will be contradicted by understanding the Saviour to mean 'water' when he says 'water.' But I want to know if the Baptist Church will receive children of God into its fellowship?"

B.—"Most certainly; and we want none other."

James—"Well, you think persons must be 'born again' before they are baptized—must be children of God first?"

B.—"Just so."

James—"Will you, then, receive an 'unbaptized child of God' into fellowship?"

B.—"We receive them; we vote on them: we must first be assured of their being new creatures."

James—"All that does not answer my question. You say persons must have the pardon of sins, and become children of God, before being baptized; that you are willing to receive children of God into fellowship. Hence you must be willing

to fellowship unbaptized persons. I ask, do you do it?"

B.—"God must receive them first, and then we receive them."

James—"God receives them without baptism; but the Baptist Church will not! It is more difficult, then, to get into the Baptist Church than to get into the kingdom of heaven!"

B.—"We have a right to make our own arrangements about receiving and rejecting members."

James—"Certainly. But, if you were followers of Christ and belonged to his church, you would not dare thus to change the terms of admission!" To which there was no reply, and the conversation ceased.

CHAPTER XXIV.

JAMES AND JANE DISCUSS THE FORMER'S TROUBLES—
JAMES' OPINION OF THE BAPTIST CHURCH—THE
PROTRACTED MEETING — EXPERIENCE — TELLING —
JAMES' FATHER AND MOTHER JOIN THE BAPTISTS
—WHAT JAMES THINKS OF IT—HE IS VISITED BY
MANY FRIENDS, AND FINALLY BY REV. MR. BONNER.

That evening, when James and Jane had returned home, and were quietly seated in their own parlor, James said: "My dear, what kind of spiritual or ecclesiastical gauntlet did you have to run in order to get into the Baptist Church?"

Jane—"I attended the meetings then in progress till I became convinced that I have never been baptized, and, along with my parents and brothers, signified my intention to obey the gospel. In a few days there was an appointment for baptism. We were all present at the appointed time, and, along with the other candidates, gave in what was called our experience. I had heard many others, and had concluded that I was not fit to be baptized, for I had never seen the sights nor heard the sounds that they had. My experience, however, was pronounced a good one; my desire to serve the Lord at all hazards was regarded as good evidence of regeneration. The preacher accounted for the difference between our experiences and those of others by the difference in our former lives."

James—"I thought that the Baptists were strict in their adherence to the Scriptures. But this experience-telling is all in addition to the teaching of Christ and his apostles."

Jane—"Perhaps they only carry it to an extreme."

James—"What would the Pentecostians have done in this catechetical performance? If each had been called upon to relate his experience, there would have been no baptism that day! But there is no occurrence in the word of God of anything of the kind."

Jane—"Cornelius told a fine experience."

James—"But he was not regarded a fit subject of baptism because he had seen an angel, but because he and his house were endued with supernatural power."

Jane—"But, anyway, was it not the experience that satisfied the six brethren who came with Peter that they were proper subjects of Christian baptism?"

James—"By no means. Peter said, 'Who can forbid water that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?' The same thought is also contained in his answer to the other apostles, 'What was I that I could withstand God, seeing that he gave them the like gift that he did unto us?' Their fitness for baptism was therefore determined by the fact that they had been enabled to speak with tongues that they had never learned. But this was never found in the case of any Gentiles afterward, that we

know of. It appears, then, that as the Holy Spirit had pointed out the time to preach the gospel to the Jews, by its presence, so also it must have been present when the gospel began to be preached to the Gentiles. When Philip preached Christ to the Samaritans, and they believed, they were baptized; and so it was everywhere. Besides, the Saviour demands that we confess him. But, instead of confessing Christ, as Timothy did, before many witnesses, these Baptists confess themselves!"

Jane—"You may be too much for argument and controversy. If everything is not just as it was in the days of the apostles, we have only to do the best that we can. I think that, were your religious trials and determinations declared to the Baptist Church, you would be received without delay."

James—"I have been entirely too much given to controversy to suit all pedobaptists for some time, simply because I wanted to know the will of the Lord concerning the action and subjects of baptism. And my offending, I presume, has been because their theory is wrong. During all this time, however, I was not a particle too much given to controversy to suit Baptists, because in those questions they held the truth. But now, as I call in question their unscriptural practices, I am, even with them, a shade too controversial!"

Jane—"But, if you more nearly agree with the Baptists than with any other religious body, would it not be better to ignore, as far as possible, the

matters in which you differ from them, and join the Baptist Church?"

James—"I have set out to know the will of the Lord, and to do what he has commanded me to do. And not until I can see that I can do that by joining the Baptist Church will I join it. There are several things in the Baptist Church to which I object. 1. I object to the name 'Baptist,' which was never Scripturally given to the followers of Christ. 2. They do not have the same officers that there were in the primitive church. Now they have one elder and one deacon to each church; then there was a plurality of each in every church; now one man may be an elder over two or more churches; no man could be an elder in any but the church where he held his membership; they have no evangelists, but the primitive church had. 3. Their theory of once in grace always in grace, is so Calvinistic in its groundwork, and false and pernicious in its results, and so perfectly unlike the teachings of the apostles, that it is very unpleasant to me."

Jane—"Let me interrupt you, dear. Do you think God ever begins a work and then fails to complete it?"

James—"So the Universalist asks, and then reasons that, because the Saviour came into the world that the world through him might be saved, therefore the world will certainly be saved. Baptists reason the same, only they think the Saviour has undertaken to save but a certain class. Now, the mistake that they both make is in failing to

recognize human instrumentality in the work of salvation. God has done his part that all men may be saved; but many will not be saved, not because they were foreordained to eternal woe, but, as the Saviour said to the Jews, 'they would not.'

4. I object to the Baptists, in the fourth place, because their teaching on the subject of hereditary depravity has no foundation in the Scriptures. 5. And the special, abstract operation of the Spirit of God on the sinner's heart is alike unknown to the Scriptures. 6. They do not seem to know anything at all on the subject of regeneration. 7. They demand an experience of sights, sounds and dreams from the sinner, rather than the confession of faith in Christ taught by the Saviour and the apostles. 8. They do not seem to believe the teaching of the Lord and his apostles with respect to the plan of salvation. 9. They seem to be followers of John the Baptist rather than followers of Christ. 10. Their monthly communions seem to be perpetuated in total ignorance of the fact that primitive Christians met every first day of the week, to break bread, or in utter disregard of such apostolic example."

"There, there, my dear," said Jane, "you have certainly gone far enough for one speech. Let us sleep on that, and we may have something for another day."

The next day they were informed that a protracted meeting had sprung up in the Baptist Church, and they had been especially invited to attend; but, as James had business at the dock,

they did not attend the meeting till the evening of the next day.

After the sermon, those who had "found peace in believing," and "desired to join the Baptist Church," were requested to take the front seat. More than twenty persons went forward and took the seat, among whom were Presbyterians and Episcopalians who had attended the investigations at James Cuggill's. But, more to his astonishment than anything else, James' father and mother were among the number who were thus asking admission into the Baptist Church. James was a silent spectator during the whole of the service. He heard one after another give the account of religious convictions; frames and feelings, visions and dreams were in abundance. Some had seen angels; one or two had seen the Saviour, but most of them had only seen ("Dick") the devil. But he wondered if his father and mother had lost their common sense! They, too, were finally called upon to tell their experience. His father gave a somewhat minute account of his former hatred for the Baptists; how he had tried to keep his son from marrying Jane Freeman, and what convictions he had had, and what compunctions he had suffered, on account of it. And last, how he had tried to keep his son from hearing the reasonings of Rev. Mr. Bonner on the action of baptism; what pains and tears and trials he had endured on account of his waywardness in these respects; and how, after all, he had been made to know the right way of the Lord. This was taken as a

good experience. No one could doubt that it was the Holy Spirit leading him through these dark scenes for his future good and his eternal salvation. The story of his mother was short, and quite sensible, and, although it was voted "sound," still he noticed that it did not call forth a single exclamation.

The next day was set for their baptism, and the same place was selected for that purpose where James had demanded baptism and had been refused. Nearly a thousand persons were present to witness the solemn rite. James was deeply affected to see his father and mother buried with Christ and risen again. The services were very impressive, and all returned home feeling that they were made better by witnessing obedience to Christ.

James and Jane were constant in their attendance at the meetings. Jane did not urge her husband to join, nor did she talk much to him on the subject. She thought he had been so long on the lookout for mistakes and transgressions of the perfect law of God that his taste for criticism was rather to be blunted than encouraged. But, as the meeting was drawing to a close, she became extremely anxious about him, and all the more because he seemed to be losing his interest in the meetings. *Her* father and *his* father and many friends visited him, and talked with him about the salvation of his soul. But they soon learned to avoid anything like argument with him, for in every instance, when they did engage in any con-

troversy with him, they never failed to come off second best. They inquired if Jane had tried him in argument, for she had come to be regarded as one of the best critics, as well as one of the most pious of women. Jane informed them that she had heard his reasons against the Baptist Church, and had to confess that she knew not how to answer them. Rev. Mr. Bonner was finally told that the case must be attended to, for, if that meeting closed without bringing James into the fold, there was danger of him becoming completely disgusted with everything like religion.

Mr. Bonner called to see James, and sought to know what hindered, that he did not go with them.

James told him that he had had no such an experience as those that were being told there night after night; and that, while he thought they were correct in their position with respect to the action of baptism, he knew they were wrong concerning the design of it.

B.—“But you ought to realize here that you are setting up your judgment in opposition to many of the most learned and pious of the earth.”

James—“I do not regard the *‘learned and pious’* as I once did. Once I thought that my salvation hinged right on the decisions of these canonical men, but I have learned that they are only men, after all. This argument of learning and piety is pleaded in behalf of every falsehood in existence. Now, sir, if you can not sustain yourself and your propositions by the word of God, it is because your

positions are false. But, at any rate, your learning and piety argument is no go."

B.—"I think that all the doctrines of the Baptist Church are taught in the Scriptures. But I wished to soften you down a little before I would begin the Scripture part of the argument."

James—"I have little need of softening; and, if I had, the old, threadbare claim of superior wisdom and piety would not accomplish the intended object."

B.—"We believe that baptism is a command of God. Are we wrong in that?"

James—"I think not. You also believe that to get to heaven God's commandments must be kept."

B.—"Certainly."

James—"But men and women may have pardon and get to heaven as well without obeying one of these commands as with it!"

B.—"Now I perceive that this is the way that you succeed in getting the advantage in argument with those that talk with you, and I feel it my duty to explain to you your situation. You must be made to know that this desire to get the advantage in debate comes not of the Holy Spirit. We believe that the Lord's Supper is a command of God, and necessary to be kept, but not in order to the pardon of sins. In the same light we view baptism."

James—"The purpose of the Supper and the purpose of baptism are very different. The one is to keep us in remembrance of the Saviour, as disciples of Christ; the other is the putting on of

Christ. That you regard one of these just as you do the other, may all be true enough, and be admitted without question, but that your regards are according to the Scripture is yet to be seen."

B.—"I was only answering your quibble about my believing it to be a command, and believing that commands must be kept, and yet allowing that persons can be saved without baptism."

James—"Certainly that was your intent; but what an answer! We know that there are commands that we might obey as Christians, and, as such, we can not sinlessly neglect them, but they are not initiatory. Baptism is initiatory, and therefore not to be classed with them any more than faith and repentance."

B.—"I think you ought to prove that baptism is initiatory, and not simply assume it."

James—"In all the accounts of conversion recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, baptism is one of the items. This is true from the day of Pentecost to the last convert recorded by Luke. Hence baptism was not initiatory, or Luke and the apostles did not understand it."

B.—"I believe that you take the old Catholic ground, that baptism is for the remission of sins. Now, sir, I am sure that that doctrine has done more injury, brought in more damnable heresies, and sent more souls to hell, than any other doctrine ever advocated."

James—"You may be sure of it; but, you see, that is not much of an argument with me. You may seek to disgrace it by classing it with Catholic

penance; but that has no more weight than the other. If you had said something like this, you would have been correct: 'I believe you take the same view of baptism that Peter presented on the day of Pentecost, and that Christ taught in the great commission,' etc."

B.—"I will call to-morrow and prove to you that baptism is not for the remission of sins."

Thus the first interview on this subject terminated.

CHAPTER XXV.

THE MEETING—FINDING PEACE—OBJECTIONS TO BAPTISM FOR REMISSION—THIRD PARTY—CAN'T BELIEVE IT—SCRIPTURE TEACHING—REGENERATION BEFORE FAITH AND REPENTANCE—CONSEQUENCE—HOW OF INFANT REGENERATION?—NO MAN CAN COME TO CHRIST EXCEPT DRAWN OF THE FATHER—EXCEPT IT WERE GIVEN OF GOD—HOW GIVEN?—BELIEVE NOT BECAUSE NOT OF MY SHEEP—MEANING OF SHEEP AND THE PASSAGE.

The next day, Rev. Mr. Bonner called to further enlighten James on the plan of pardon, and began by remarking that a great many were then “finding peace through the blood of the everlasting atonement.”

James—“What do you mean by ‘finding peace’?”

B.—“That they have pardon, and hence peace with God.”

James—“That is plain. But do you not base your evidence of pardon on peace, rather than the peace on the proper evidence of pardon? The peace of mind is had in consequence of some surety, real or imaginary, of acceptance with God. And the peace will be all the same though the evidence is purely fictitious. Hence, that your converts profess to have peace is, to me, no evidence of their regeneration or acceptance with God.”

B.—“I discover that you are under the whip and spur of spiritual pugilism. You are ready

to snap at even a casual remark, and, by some means, wring argument out of it. I am afraid that this disposition is not of the Lord."

James—"You are evidently trying to lay the foundation for an argument, by getting me to assent to your carefully laid proposition that these persons, through the prayers of the church, were being pardoned without, or before, being baptized. And now, sir, a man that can think of sheltering his cause under such a covering, has no right to pronounce upon the spirit by which another speaks."

B.—"We will leave that matter, for I have no time for useless controversy. I have some objections to your theory of baptismal regeneration."

James—"Before you proceed, I wish to inform you that I do not hold any doctrine that may be called by that term. Though I have been brought up in the faith that an infant, unless baptized by the hands of a properly ordained minister, is not in a saved state, I am glad to say I am well of that malady. I do not now believe that baptism changes the mind, except as it is the obtaining of a good conscience before God. And, further, that baptism is not valid, unless it is preceded by faith and repentance. I hope, therefore, that you will be content with simply considering the subject, without speaking disrespectfully of my position. Show me, if you can, that baptism is not for the remission of sins. But, if you can not, you might change your theology on that point, so that it will agree better with the Bible."

B.—"You seem to be given to needless fault-finding."

James—"Not at all. You must consider the subject fairly, and I intend you to know it right at the start."

B.—"Well, there are some objections against baptism being for the remission of sins, which I will offer. 1. It makes salvation depend upon the agency of another than the one to be saved. 2. It makes salvation depend upon works, which is clearly contradicted in the Scriptures. 3. It involves difficulties perfectly insurmountable."

James—"We will consider one of these objections at a time."

B.—"I can not be made to believe that any man's salvation was ever made to depend upon a third party!"

James—"Well, I suppose that the question is settled, then! For, certainly, I have no right to suppose that any doctrine might possibly be true that you 'can not be made to believe'! You give us argument, evidence and conclusion in a nutshell! But, seriously, Reverend, did you ever know certainly of the salvation of any one without the third party?"

B.—"I think you ought to ask for prayers; your spiritual well-being is in a very critical condition. Your effort seems to be to turn everything into ridicule."

James—"I could not make your present effort at argument more ridiculous, if I should try; and I have no inclination to try. But come, now,

slide down off your immense disgust, and answer my question like a man. Have you any Scriptural assurance of the salvation of any one from sins without the intervention of a third party?"

B.—"Well, I think—I suppose—my position is—I would like to know if you think that God can not save a man from his sins without the assistance of some man. Answer that, please."

James—"Your question has no connection with the subject. We are not trying to decide what God can and what he can not do. My question is both to the point and of such practical nature that you can easily answer it. I *demand* that you answer it."

B.—"I can only think of one case that is clearly in answer to your question: Saul of Tarsus."

James—"When was Saul of Tarsus pardoned?"

B.—"When he first believed in the Lord."

James—"When was that?"

B.—"When he heard the Saviour say, 'I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest.'"

James—"He had rather tough treatment after that for a saint, being blind for three days, and in such torture of mind that he refused both meat and drink. But, still worse for your 'single case,' Ananias said to him, 'Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord' (Acts xxii. 16). How could Ananias say this, if he had been pardoned when he heard the Saviour on the way?"

B.—"He was really pardoned when he believed, but formally pardoned when baptized."

James—"How did you find that out?"

B.—"I see that you will admit nothing. It is not at all satisfactory to argue the question with you."

James—"I presume, to make the argument satisfactory to you, I will have to admit your assertions without any proof. But I shall not do it. If Saul was pardoned before Ananias came to him, neither he nor Luke ever found it out; or, at least, they have given no intimation of the kind."

B.—"Of course, you will have him pardoned in baptism. But I shall prove that men are pardoned by faith, and not by baptism."

James—"Distant thunder is not what I want. I asked for an instance of pardon under the law of Christ without the employment of a third party. You cited Saul of Tarsus as a case in hand; but he does not prove to be a case in hand. And if you were to sustain your last assertion, that he was pardoned the moment that he believed, it would not prove that he came to his faith without the assistance of a third party. How did he know who Jesus of Nazareth was? Now, his faith was not simply that the one thus miraculously appearing before him was Jesus of Nazareth, but that he was the Christ, the long foretold Messiah of the prophets. This you will hardly call in question; but, if you should, what Saul began to preach in the synagogues right after his baptism would be sufficient proof. But how did he know anything of this promised Messiah? It is simply certain, therefore, that Saul came to saving faith

through the teaching of the prophets, and his teachers in the law, as well as by the words of Jesus. Whatever, therefore, you may say of it, Saul came to the remission of his sins by the aid of a third party."

B.—"No man will ever be able to show that a third person is necessary to the salvation of any individual."

James—"Perhaps no one will ever be able to show that mountains, rivers, bays, lakes, etc., are an absolute necessity to the existence of this world."

B.—"That is off the subject entirely."

James—"No doubt of it. It went in search of your last argument."

B.—"I see constant evidences of your want of regeneration. By your consent, I will pray for you."

James—"I will agree to it; but I want you to promise that, in the first place, you will not use up all your time in this way, so that you can excuse yourself from further consideration of the subject; and, second, that you will not argue this question before the Lord, and then charge me with worldly-mindedness in case I take notes of such continued argumentation. Do you promise?"

B.—"I never heard of such a demand being made of any preacher of the gospel before!"

James—"You see I care but little about what you have heard of before. I am not disposed to let a man pray his theology out of difficulties. If your prayer is to the Lord, you can as well offer

it at any other time; if it is intended only for me, you may save yourself the labor. What I want is, to know the will of the Lord with respect to my duty; if it is to pray and be prayed for till the Lord will be constrained to perform some miraculous operation on me, well and good; but I must see the authority for it."

B.—"I shall deal with you in the future just as though you had no interest in Christianity, save the pleasure of conducting argument."

James—"Do so, if you like. But that is not the case by any means. I want to be saved, and to that end am willing to do anything the Lord requires of me; so you might treat me respectfully, unless your theology is likely to suffer by it."

B.—"Suppose that a third person were necessary, but such a third person can not be had, or refuses to act?"

James—"In either case it would be bad. The last case would be just yours, in refusing me baptism."

B.—"But God can hardly be thought to be the author of any such difficulties."

James—"God is the author of many things that I can not understand; but I do not deny them on that account."

B.—"You seem to think, then, that the Scriptures really teach the intervention of a third person?"

James—"I know they do; and hence I can only regard your reasoning as an effort to get away from what God has revealed!"

B.—“Just point out the teachings of the Scriptures on that subject, please.”

James—“With the greatest of pleasure. In I. Tim. iv. 16, Paul says to Timothy: ‘Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.’ For a second lesson, take Paul’s commission—Acts xxvi. 15-18. Here the Lord tells why he appeared to him: to make him a witness, and to send him unto the Gentiles, ‘to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, *that they may receive forgiveness of sins*, and inheritance among them who are sanctified by faith that is in me.’ But these are but specimens. The Pentecostians were brought to remission through the preaching and administration of the apostles. Again, at Solomon’s temple, the thousands were brought into the faith through the efforts of Peter and John. When Samaria was to accept of Christ, Philip went and preached to them. So it was with the eunuch. But why should I continue? There is not a case of faith in Christ and obedience to his gospel, without the work of man in it.”

B.—“Men have a kind of head faith through the written word, or through the voice of the preacher, but it is not saving faith. I understand that God first regenerates the sinner by an immediate operation of the Spirit upon the sinner’s heart; hence the sinner is made to feel that he is really a sinner, and repents that he may have saving faith.”

James—"Thus saith the Lord? or is it only Baptist theology, for which no Scripture may be found? Now I would like to know if a person is in a saved condition when he is regenerated?"

B.—"I think he is. Why, certainly he is."

James—"Then a man may be regenerated and saved without faith, without repentance, or anything of the sort. Nay, it must always be the case. Hence, if he dies just then, he is saved. He has lived under gospel teaching, but he has been an unbeliever. Now he is regenerated and saved, and goes to glory without faith in Christ! Can you tell me what the Saviour meant by 'he that believeth not shall be damned' (Mark xvi. 16)?"

B.—"But you see that saving faith follows immediately."

James—"But still, in point of time, it is subsequent to regeneration. Hence persons are saved without faith!"

B.—"I think there is no difference in point of time."

James—"I am sure that no one, unless especially called, can understand your theology. First, regeneration necessarily precedes both repentance and faith. Second, these things *follow* as the result of regeneration. But now repentance and faith are a part of regeneration, and are produced by the same Spirit, at the same time. If any man can untangle your arrangement, and yet preserve it whole, I shall be ready to believe him 'especially called.' But now another difficulty arises: as you believe in the regeneration of all infants that die

in infancy, I would like to know in what their regeneration may be supposed to consist? For certainly it does not work repentance and faith in them!"

B.—"You are skilled in raising difficulties. But that will not prove that my doctrine is wrong."

James—"If you should try to sustain your position by quotations from the word of God, I would try the correctness of your exegesis; but, as you only seek to reason upon the subject, I am left simply to test the soundness and validity of your reasonings. So far, at least, your deductions have been unsound, as is clearly to be seen from your inability to answer my objections to them."

B.—"I see that I am driven to the necessity of showing you that saving faith comes immediately from God, without any human intervention whatever. For this purpose, I call your attention to the Gospel according to St. John, vi. 44: 'No man can come to me, except the Father who hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day.' Thus you see the utter impossibility of being one of Christ's true followers unless previously drawn of the Father. Hence we have in verse 65: 'Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.' Now, sir, that is Scripture!"

James—"You seem to read just what you can make suit your theory. According to Paul (Heb. xi. 6), no one can come to God except he first believe that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. Hence the gift spoken

of in the sixty-fifth verse, and the 'drawing' of verse 44, must be faith. Now, it is admitted on all hands that faith must precede acceptable coming to Christ, and is clearly taught in John vi. and Hebrews xi. But, so far as quotations that have been made are concerned, the question as to how men get faith, or how God gives faith, is untouched. The mere fact that it is given of God, and must be had, does not decide how it comes. But if you will be at the trouble of reading the forty-fifth verse, you will get the Saviour's teaching on that subject: 'It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.' In this quotation two prophecies are referred to—Isa lvi. 13 and Jer. xxxi. 34. These prophets had thus foretold one of the great characteristic differences between the disciples of Christ and the children of Israel, and thus placed the two covenants in striking contrast with each other. In the old—under the law—there were many that did know the Lord; but in the new they must all know the Lord; must all be taught of God; must all have heard and have learned of the Father. Many were present that did not believe; Jesus knew this; he knew also who would finally betray him. They had followed him for the loaves and fishes, but not because they believed him to be the Messiah. But, had they heard the teaching of God by the prophets, had they heard and learned of the Father, they would have believed. The fault was, therefore,

entirely their own. They might have been taught of God, and thus drawn to the Saviour, but they had refused the teachings that God had provided. Your quotation is, therefore, a very unhappy one for your theory. For, instead of indicating that they were to be constituted believers and saved without human agency, it shows just the opposite: 1. That they come to Christ by faith. 2. That faith is a gift of God, through the revelation of his will. 3. That the reason that they had not believed was, that they had not listened to God's teaching."

B.—"You are quite a theologian. But I have marked some other passages against human instrumentality. I will see how you get along with them. John x. 26: 'But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you.' Thus you see that, after all, persons must be Christ's sheep, or they can not believe on him."

James—"What does he mean by 'sheep'?"

B.—"Why, children of God, of course!"

James—"Where is it said that that is the meaning?"

B.—"I supposed that every one so regarded it."

James—"That is not answering my question. How did you learn that the Saviour meant children of God when he said sheep?"

B.—"I do not know what he could have meant, if that was not the meaning."

James—"That makes your argument conclusive! But, in earnest, read verses 4, 14 and 27, and you will see that what he refers to by that

word is the disposition to accept of testimony. His sheep would hear him, hence would believe in him. Those who were not his sheep were those who were not disposed to accept of the truth, and hence they did not believe. This will explain verse 16: 'Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold.' People were not alone to be found among the Jews who would accept of the truth and be his disciples. The Saviour does not give the remotest hint that there was any special favor or supernatural power employed in inclining any one to him. Hence your theory finds no support in this passage."

B.—"Your skill in evading the force of an argument is most wonderful. But I will call again to-morrow, and prove to you that faith, saving faith, is a direct gift of God; and that when a man has that faith, that moment he is pardoned from past sins."

James—"Your promises remind me of those of Rev. Mr. McCarron on the action of baptism. I apprehend that they are just promises!"

B.—"We can tell better to-morrow evening. Come to meeting to-night."

James—"I will."

CHAPTER XXVI.

JAMES VISITS THE MEETING THEN IN PROGRESS—IS PRAYED FOR—IS EXHORTED, AND FINALLY SPEAKS, TO THE DISSATISFACTION OF SOME—IS VISITED AGAIN BY REV. B., WHO BRINGS FORWARD THE SCRIPTURES TO PROVE THAT SAVING FAITH IS A DIRECT GIFT OF GOD, WITHOUT THE EMPLOYMENT OF HUMAN INSTRUMENTALITY.

That night James was present at the protracted meeting. A number of persons were made the special subjects of prayer, some of whom were present, and some absent. Some one during the day had proposed prayers that evening for James Cuggill, and, of course, he heard himself called up before God by the pious ones that bowed around the altar. If God should prefer to work some miracle upon him, to make him a more knowing and a better man, why should he object? But the truth was, he had no thought that God ever acted in that way. He had concluded that God had made it possible for us to be saved from our sins, and had demanded of us that we should accept of the salvation that he had offered; but it had not entered his mind that God was going to drug a sinner with salvation. However, he would wait and see. The members of the church were called upon to take part in this work of petitioning a throne of grace on behalf of helpless sinners. His father and mother, father-in-law and mother-

in-law were called upon to pray for James Cuggill. And, last, his wife was called upon to pray for her husband. She did so, but her prayer did not evoke the usual amount of pious groans. She asked that God's providence might be such that her husband would be led to see his duty clearly, and that he might render that obedience to which is promised eternal life. It is safe to say that James had more interest in this last prayer than in all the rest that had been offered that night.

At length came the conference meeting. In this, the young converts were most conspicuous. Several, that had found peace that night, related their experiences. Some had been seeking for months without obtaining the Lord. They were willing to do anything, if only the Lord would have mercy upon them and save them. James thought that the invitation to speak was sufficiently comprehensive to include him. Hence he arose and said:

"I, too, am a seeker. In the good providence of God, I have been led to search the Scriptures, that I might know my duty before God. I have been led to abandon infant baptism, and to believe that those who have not been immersed have not been baptized. I have taken a deep interest in your meetings. I have been made happy in witnessing the obedience of many to the Saviour. Especially so, to see my father and mother buried with Christ in baptism.

"But there are some things that I can't understand. I learn from the Scriptures that they that

seek shall find ; but there are some that have sought the Lord for six months without any apparent success. Now, the question that has arisen in my mind is, *Whose fault is it?* They are anxious to be saved, doing all that the system of theology to which they have entrusted themselves demands of them, and hence *it is not their fault*. Is it God's fault? Is he unwilling, or unable, to save them? Or is your system of theology at fault?

"Again, I have noticed that each one, in relating an experience, seems to boast of some doubts. And what, if possible, is still stranger, those doubts in the individual seem to be sureties in the minds of the members of the church. Now, I can not understand, for the life of me, how an experience that makes the individual that relates it doubt his acceptance with God, can make those that hear it feel confident that he is a child of God. Is it because the experience is like yours that you think it to be sound?—thus setting yourselves up as standards by which to measure the hearts and souls of others. Now, I suggest, as a cure for this doubting, that you doubt those who are doubtful. My word for it, you will have few experiences in the future of the doubtful kind. Or, to speak plainly, my mind on the subject is, that your theology commends and encourages a mock modesty, a pretended humility, which, if you lay aside, you may become confirmed believers.

"Once more: many of you have prayed for sinners to cry out and ask, 'What must we do to be saved?' Sinners have asked that question here

to-night; but, instead of answering it as an inspired apostle answered that question (Acts ii. 38), you tell them to pray, and then pray with them. Now, why not tell them, as Peter did on the day of Pentecost, 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost'?"

Deacon Tyler spoke up: "We want no controversy. This is not a debating school. We came here to seek the Lord."

To which James said: "I do not desire, in any way, to intrude upon your meetings. But, as it is a meeting for seeking, I thought I might seek the way of the Lord. And, seeing that your practices are in many respects different from the teaching of the word of God, I thought I might learn if the will of the Lord had been changed since it was first preached by the apostles, who were inspired by the Spirit of God, sent down from heaven."

A song was started by a brother in the back part of the house, in which all joined with zeal, and soon after the audience was dismissed.

The next day, at the usual hour, Rev. Mr. Bonner came to further assist our young friend on his way to heaven.

"Your people were not well pleased with what I said last night," said James.

B.—"How do you know?"

James—"Because they interrupted me, and finally sang me down. I think still less of your

system, when I see your unwillingness to have the word of God quoted in your meetings."

B.—"I have about only so long to stay at this time, and I want to show you to-day that faith, by which a sinner is made alive in Christ, comes not through human instrumentality. The first Scripture to which I call your attention is found in I. Cor. xii. 9. Paul is enumerating the gifts of the Spirit to every man, to profit withal. He says, 'To another, faith by the same Spirit.' From this Scripture there can be no appeal. It says, in so many words, 'to another, faith by the same Spirit.'"

James—"You ought first to see if this is the faith by which men are justified. And, in the second place, you ought to know if giving by the Spirit means giving, or forcing, without means, and without the consent of the receiver, or giving through means, as God usually bestows upon us his blessings. Now, concerning the first of these questions, we know that it was not the faith by which men are saved; for, first, Paul was writing to Christians, who had been saved before they received this faith; second, it was a lesson upon supernatural powers, or power to work miracles. Compare Matt. xvii. 19, 20; I. Cor. xiii. 2. Hence you will have to look again."

B.—"As I can not afford much time upon this point, I will leave that text, and call attention to Eph. ii. 8-10: 'For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For

we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.' Now I want to show you from this text, not only that salvation is not of works, but is of faith, and that this faith is also the gift of God. Thus we are created anew in Christ Jesus, after which it is possible for us to do good works."

James—"Paul shows these Ephesian brethren, first, that they were saved, not because their lives were perfect before God, but by grace; second, that they had been enabled to lay hold upon this grace through faith; third, and though they thus laid hold upon salvation by obedience to the faith, still they were not thus meriting it, but simply accepting the gift of God."

B.—"The apostle says, just as plainly as words can be made to say, that faith was not of themselves, but was the gift of God. Hence the gift of God excludes human effort, for their faith was not of themselves. It must be remembered that by this faith, which was the gift of God, they were made partakers of the grace by which they had salvation."

James—"Simply assuming will not do. You say that Paul did say so and so; but I say that Paul did not say such things. And the only way I know of to determine whether he did or did not, is to have something like a careful analysis. I ask, then, what is the antecedent of 'that' in verse 8—'and *that* not of yourselves'? It can only possibly be one of these three: 'saved,' 'grace,' 'faith.'

The subject of the whole chapter is the salvation through Christ, provided even for Gentiles. Gentiles and Jews were all alike sinners; hence their salvation was not based upon their works. In every possible way, the apostle keeps before the Jew and the Gentile in this congregation the fact that it was only in Christ that they could possibly have salvation. Of the three things to which 'that' may refer, saved or salvation has the preference. Let us see if the antecedent of 'that' might be grace. Some things are said subsequently to it. 1. 'Not of yourselves.' Paul would not say that of grace. Any man of any sense at all would know that God's favor was 'not of themselves.' 2. 'It is the gift of God.' Would Paul say that grace is the gift of God? 3. 'Not of works.' Would he say the grace of God is not of works? 4. 'That not of yourselves.' Would Paul be under the necessity of saying that grace or favor was not of themselves? I never knew him to make such a thoughtless expression. Let us see how faith will do. Would Paul say faith is 'not of works, lest any man should boast'? To ask this question is to answer it. Hence the exegesis that I gave of the passage in the start is the only one that will stand. And, further, Paul reveals just how both Jew and Gentile came to that faith by which they were reconciled unto God—verses 16, 17: 'And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were

nigh.' Thus it had been through the preaching of the cross of Christ that their reconciliation had been accomplished. This much I have said that we might have the meaning of the passage clearly before us, and not because my ideas of human instrumentality would suffer by admitting your interpretation. In a gift there are always two parties—the giver and receiver. The giver gives; the receiver receives. Now, unless he receives of his own choice, it is not a gift, for one of the conditions is absent. It might be an offer to give; or a compulsion; but a gift it could not be, without the choice of the receiver being consulted."

B.—"It seems that you have made a special preparation to defeat the truth at every point."

James—"You are mistaken again. I have made no such preparation. I am as anxious to know the truth as you are. But I am not ready to accept of Baptist theology without a proper examination of its witnesses."

B.—"Perhaps you can find something still further in this connection that will prove your theory exactly, that they were made believers through the preaching of the gospel."

James—"I could easily refer to their history and prove this to be true. I notice in the first chapter and thirteenth verse a very clear statement: 'In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise.'"

B.—"I have another argument on this question for to-morrow: That repentance precedes faith, and is the direct gift of God. So you may prepare yourself for a defeat at last."

CHAPTER XXVII.

JAMES HAS ANOTHER VISIT BY REV. B., WHO ESSAYS TO PROVE THAT FAITH DOES NOT COME THROUGH ANY HUMAN INSTRUMENTALITY; THAT REPENTANCE PRECEDES FAITH IN THE GOSPEL ORDER; THAT REPENTANCE IS A DIRECT GIFT—TRIES THE DOCTRINE OF HEREDITARY DEPRAVITY ONCE MORE.

Rev. Mr. Bonner called at the appointed hour. "You were not at church last night," he said to James as he took his seat. "We had a blessed meeting. It was a regular Pentecost!"

James—"Except your teaching on the way of pardon; I am sure that was not like the teaching on Pentecost."

B.—"I think the teaching was just the same as the teaching of the apostle Peter."

James—"Did you tell the inquirers to repent and be baptized, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins?"

B.—"I gave them—I told them—I instructed them—I explained that passage to them last night; you ought to have been present."

James—"I asked if you gave the same answer to the question, 'What shall we do?' that Peter gave, and you stammer. Now, you ought to act the man about it, and acknowledge that you did not! You know that you never gave the same answer to that question that Peter did, in your life. And, if you should, it would be brought up

at your next association and pronounced the worst and blackest of heresies."

B.—"We will come to that passage after awhile. But, for the present, I want to show you that repentance comes necessarily before faith, and that it is the first real sign of regeneration; that it is produced by the immediate operation of the Spirit of God upon the sinner's heart."

James—"You may proceed in any way that seems best to you. Of course, you will give us Scripture, and not your philosophy."

B.—"I will give you Scripture enough. So we will just read the declaration of the Saviour in Mark i. 15: 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel.' That repentance is here put before faith is simply certain."

James—"But is not that 'historic faith, and not saving faith'? At any rate, these Jews were not unbelievers. They had been raised up to believe in the true God. But, from practical failure in life, they needed to repent, that they might be the better prepared to believe the gospel. This is demonstrated in the fact that the followers of Christ were from the more humble and unpretending portion of the people. They needed to sorrow for their sins after a godly sort, thus changing their purposes of life, that they might be ready to receive and accredit the good news."

B.—"I will show you, by reading Acts xx. 21, that Paul presented it in the same order, not only

to the Jews, who previously believed in God, but also to the Gentiles, who had no such faith. 'Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.' "

James—"These Greeks were not Gentiles, as you seem to think, but Jews either outside of Judea, or those who had been proselyted from the Gentiles. The translation would have been clearer by the word 'Hellenist.' The same is to be found in Acts vi. 1, where we know that it could not refer to Gentiles. The *Helleesi* of Acts xx. 21, and *Helleeniston* of vi. 1, have another meaning entirely from the *Ethnesin* (Gentiles) of Acts xi. 18. Hence these persons believed in God, and were earnestly entreated to 'repent toward God.' They were not taught to repent toward Christ before they believed him; for such a thing would have been an impossibility. No man ever repented of a crime that he had no knowledge of. A man could not repent toward Christ, unless he first believed in Christ. These men believed in God, and were required to adjust their lives in harmony with their faith, that they might be better prepared to accept the truth concerning Christ. And, still further, Paul says that 'without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him' (Heb. xi. 6). Hence the first possible approach toward God is to believe in him. The idea, therefore, that repentance toward Christ precedes faith in

Christ is contrary both to reason and to Scripture."

B.—"So far as the present question is concerned, you may put faith first if you like. But I want to show that repentance is the gift of God. II. Tim. ii. 25: 'If God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.' Acts v. 31: 'Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.' Again, Acts xi. 18: 'When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life.' These Scriptures speak for themselves. They are too plain to be mistaken."

James—"No one doubts that repentance is a gift of God. So is faith, so is baptism, so is every part and parcel of the Christian system. We do not differ as to the fact, but as to the how! We may pray, 'Give us this day our daily bread,' with an assurance that we shall be heard. But, if we reason from such general premises to a particular manner of fulfilling it, we reason incorrectly. If a man expects that, because the Lord may be expected to give us our daily bread, he must therefore rain down loaves for the disciples, he will simply mistake the meaning of the passage; but not more so than you have the meaning of those that you have quoted. If we will learn the divine means of bringing men to repentance, we may easily do so by reading the following Scriptures: Luke xxiv. 47—"Repentance" preached. Matt. iii.

8; Mark i. 15; Acts ii. 38; iii. 19; xvii. 30—Men are commanded to repent; which would have been perfectly meaningless if men did not have the ability to repent. II. Cor. vii. 8-10: 'Godly sorrow leadeth to repentance.' Rom. ii. 4: 'The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance.' Thus, when the apostles would bring men to repentance, they preached Christ to them till they saw themselves as sinners, and sorrowed in a godly way, and saw the goodness of God in providing them a Saviour. And while this procedure is the teaching of the Scriptures, it is in perfect keeping with the mental constitution of man."

B.—"I believe that you can do more special pleading in a shorter space of time than any one else that I have ever heard of. Your whole theory seems to be built upon the sandy foundation of human works; as though man was to work his way to heaven!"

James—"And your theory seems to take this ruinous shape, that man has no responsibility."

B.—"Paul condemns the idea of salvation by works; you think that we are saved by works. That is the difference between you and Paul."

James—"You started out to show me that baptism is not for the remission of sins. Your first assertion was that God saved men without the intervention of a third party. If you have now abandoned that, we will proceed to consider your second allegation, that baptism for remission is salvation by works. If you are now ready to acknowledge that there has never been found a clearly attested

case of faith in Christ, or repentance toward him, where the gospel was not read or taught, and thus acknowledge that, so far as we may know, either by Scripture or history, all men who are brought into a saved condition through Christ are thus blessed through the instrumentality of their fellows, I will examine your second charge against baptism being for remission."

B.—"I am not ready to thus tamely submit to your terms. But I perceive that further argument on my first proposition would be unnecessary. I hope, therefore, to be allowed to proceed."

James—"Certainly. If you have nothing more to say on the first, you may proceed to the second."

B.—"My charge, then, is this: baptism for remission makes salvation to depend upon works. Paul condemns the idea that salvation is by works. Hence baptism is not for remission."

"My first argument is that, on account of the depravity of man's nature, no human action is truly good in the sight of God, till that depravity shall have been removed, and sins pardoned. Hence the inability of man to do anything meritorious, by which he might obtain pardon."

James—"I have no desire to put man's salvation upon the merit of anything that he can do. Were I drowning, and a kind friend were to bring relief within my reach, though we could hardly say that there would be anything meritorious in my accepting the kind offer of my friend, still I

might be lost unless I did. The certainty of my salvation by accepting the offer, or the certainty of being lost unless I should, can hardly be made into an evidence of my merit. Hence, if you succeed in your allegation concerning man's want of merit, you will be a long way off from showing that it is not necessary for men to accept of the mercy provided."

B.—"I want to return to the doctrine of hereditary total depravity. Perhaps you will accept it now."

James—"I do not."

B.—"Why do you refuse the doctrine?"

James—"1. Because there is no evidence that it is true. 2. Because there is very much evidence that it is not true."

B.—"I would like to have your reasons against the doctrine of hereditary total depravity in detail, that I may answer them."

James—"My first is, that such phraseology nowhere occurs in the Scriptures. Now, a doctrine that can not be properly and adequately stated by using Scripture phraseology, is probably not taught in them.

"2. All arguments in favor of the doctrine are only inferential. There has been no clear statement made of it.

"3. As a matter of fact, it is not true; for the unregenerate have done many things that were truly good.

"4. It makes man as bad as the devil himself. Depravity can not be more than total.

"5. It makes man irresponsible; for if he has no power to turn and to do good works, etc., then he is not responsible for not doing so.

"6. God is made unjust in condemning man for doing wrong, when his nature compels him to do it!

"7. God is thus made responsible for all that are lost.

"8. God can not love man without loving total depravity!

"9. Men would never incline to believe the truth, their natures being in direct opposition.

"10. Man could not be redeemed; for there would be nothing to redeem but total depravity.

"11. Man can not be punished, according to Matt. xxi. 41, for they would be worthy of everlasting punishment for what Adam did!"

"12. Men are said to 'go astray, speaking lies,' which they could not do if they were born totally astray.

"13. 'Wicked men and seducers will wax worse and worse.' But how a man could wax worse than total depravity, would be difficult for a Baptist theologian to decide!

"14. God has never treated man, in a single instance, as though he thought him totally depraved.

"15. The Saviour said, 'Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God.' Surely, they were not totally depraved!

"16. The gospel scheme of human redemption is represented as a refiner's fire and a fuller's soap.

But, if this doctrine be true, there is nothing of him but dross. Hence, after the refining and cleansing, nothing would be left!

“17. In the parable of the ‘sower,’ man’s heart is represented as the soil, into which the seed of the kingdom of God, the word of truth, might fall, and spring up, and bring forth fruit unto eternal life. But, if this doctrine be true, there is nothing in the human heart congenial to the word of God! What a saving it would be if Satan could only be brought over to your theological views! He would then cease to steal away the word of God out of men’s hearts, supposing it to be powerless in such a barren soil.

“18. Paul says that the Gentiles did ‘by nature the things contained in the law’ (Rom. ii. 14, 15), which could not have been true if that nature had been totally corrupt.”

B.—“Well, sir, that will do. I do not care to run over half of that ground. I will continue the argument to-morrow, without any further attempt to have you understand the truth on the subject of human depravity.”

CHAPTER XXVIII.

HOW DEPRAVED?—WHAT THE RESULT OF ADAM'S SIN?
—WHAT NEED OF ATONEMENT?—WHAT IS THE
ATONEMENT?—SALVATION BY WORKS, OR FAITH
ONLY?—NEITHER—PAUL TO THE ROMANS, AND
JAMES COMPARED.

James—"I have been thinking over this doctrine of total hereditary depravity, since we closed our interview yesterday, and I wish you would make your best effort to sustain it. I feel confident that it is the parent of all, or nearly all, the errors that have come into our religious systems. Especially is this true with the Baptist Church. Your doctrines of abstract operation of the Spirit, spiritual-physical regeneration, infant regeneration, salvation by faith only, faith being the result of the direct operation of the Spirit, mysterious and incomprehensible origin of repentance, once in grace always in grace, baptism not for remission, etc., have all their foundation in this, as I think, fundamental error. They ought to stand or fall with it. If you can answer my objections, and show from the Scriptures that it is taught in them, I shall be willing to accept your whole theory in all its parts."

B.—"You do not believe, then, that man has been in any way injured by the fall, and therefore has no need of redemption!"

James—"So you say. But how you found it out is the question!"

B.—"Certainly, from your argument, I am at liberty so to conclude."

James—"I have never contended for any such a view, have never entertained it for a moment, and have never seen any one that did."

B.—"I would like, then, to know your exact position on this subject. To what extent do you think that man has been injured by the fall?"

James—"Death has been introduced into the world, and comes upon all men. Besides, there is an inclination to sin in the nature of every human being. But to what extent this is the result of Adam's transgression, I am unable to say. Notwithstanding, there is the desire to be free from sin, and there is the ability to accept of the right. For God has always treated man as if these things were so."

B.—"I am unable to see what use you can have for the atonement. If man is able to accept of and do that which is right, then he may just work his way to heaven; and would have been just as well off if Christ had never hung upon the cross!"

James—"The atonement was not for the purpose of enabling man to do that which is right, by mysteriously changing his nature, but to perfect a scheme of reconciliation, by and through which it would be possible for man that had sinned to be saved from that sin, and yet the dignity of God's law be preserved. Thus, instead of our death, Christ has died; instead of our suffering the pen-

alty, Christ has suffered for us. Hence, through him, we may have forgiveness of sins. But if the idea that you seem to hold with respect to the atonement be true, that thereby man is to be enabled to do that which is right, or have his nature thus supernaturally changed, a few difficulties will result. (1) Either all men, born and unborn, were, when Christ suffered upon the cross, relieved from depravity; or (2) the atonement was only intended for a few, and not, as John would say, for the sins of the whole world; or (3) that the atonement is yet being made, as persons are supernaturally operated upon!"

B.—"I confess that your criticism opens up a new field for investigation, which I am not prepared just now to enter. I will therefore dismiss the subject of hereditary total depravity. You will agree, however, that whatever may become of these questions, it belonged to the Lord Jesus Christ to decide upon what conditions pardon should be extended to the sinner."

James—"Right, for once. Any appeal, therefore, to the Saviour and his apostles will be strictly in order."

B.—"I will read Rom. iii. 20: 'Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.' Verse 22: 'Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference.' Verses 27, 28: 'Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works?

Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.' Chap. iv. 1-5: 'What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.' Verses 23, 24: 'Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.' In this connection I might refer to Tit. iii. 5: 'Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' Now, from the Scriptures the following facts are certainly established: 1. That man can not be saved by his own works. 2. That he must be saved by grace, through faith."

James—"Is there anything in that against the idea of baptism being a part of the plan of pardon?"

B.—"Certainly. If we are justified by faith without works, then baptism is excluded, for baptism is a work."

James—"Is baptism ever called a work?"

B.—"I do not remember that it was, but we know that it is, without any special definition in the Scriptures."

James—"It might be, after all, that Paul does not count it as a work in the Roman letter."

B.—"You are not to get away so easily. We know that it is a work, and Paul says that we are justified without works. Hence we are saved without baptism."

James—"But this would exclude faith as necessary to pardon; for some said unto the Master, 'What shall we do, that we may work the works of God?' Jesus answered and said unto them, 'This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent' (John vi. 28, 29). We may know, and do know, that it is more a work to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ than to be baptized; besides, it is called a work, and baptism is not thus denominated. Hence, if the word 'work' is here used indiscriminately, so as to cover all human action and human effort, it is certain that we are saved unconditionally. At least, faith is no part of the plan."

B.—"In this connection, Abraham is presented as the father of all them that believe. He was justified by faith only. And the same law is declared to extend to us, if we believe in Him that raised up our Lord Jesus from the dead."

James—"The apostle James differs from you on the subject of Abraham's justification. In his general letter, chapter ii., verses 21-23, he says: 'Was not Abraham our father justified by works,

when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God.' The conclusion also to which James comes is very different from yours. In verse 24 he says: 'Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.' "

B.—"But Paul and James must not be made to contradict each other. You will see that Paul was speaking of justifying the alien sinner; showing how a man must be saved, or receive the remission of alien sins, and introduced into the family of God. James showed them that, as children of God, they must do good works, for they had been brought into the kingdom for that purpose. Hence they need not say to the naked and destitute, 'Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled,' unless they would share their blessings with them. While, therefore, it is necessary to do good works, and while we can not live the life of the justified, by faith only, it by no means indicates that sinners are to be pardoned by works. Hence Paul and James are not speaking of the same class of persons. Paul spoke of sinners; James, of saints."

James—"You will first have to prove that sinners are justified by faith only, and saints by works in conjunction with faith, before this assertion of yours will stand as argument. But you will

notice that Paul does not say that we are justified by faith only. James says that we are not justified by faith only. And hence there is no contradiction between Paul and James, though they spoke of the same class. Hence there is no reconciliation between Paul and James needed. The difficulty is, for the present, between you and James. You said that Paul allowed that Abraham was justified by faith only. James refers to the same case, and says that he was justified by works. Paul and James are not opposed, if we allow that Abraham was justified by both faith and works."

B.—"Paul speaks of Abraham as being justified from his former idolatry. James speaks of his being justified in his good deeds, after he had been accepted of God. Hence, in the sense in which Paul spoke, he was justified by faith without deeds of law, or by faith only: 'Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.'"

James—"This last was true of Abraham, as a servant of God, at least twelve or thirteen years after he came out from his former idolatry to follow the Lord. It is recorded (Gen. xv. 6) at least twelve years after Abraham had received the promise of the Messiah. The probability is that Abraham had been a servant of the true God for nearly fifty years when 'he believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness.' The history will show us that it was not by faith only. James refers to the same Scripture, and says he

was justified by works when he offered his son Isaac upon the altar, and the Scripture was then fulfilled that said, 'Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness.' Hence, when James speaks of justification, he means just what Paul means when he speaks of it; and he has before him the same persons and circumstances that Paul had before him when he wrote the Roman letter."

B.—"But your theory will not account for the fact that Paul utterly ignores the instrumentality of works in order to salvation."

James—"It is only left for us to acquaint ourselves with his purpose, to understand just why he reasoned as he did. His thesis is announced in the first chapter and sixteenth verse. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation. But, to succeed in establishing the proposition, he had first to show that men were in need of salvation. This he did; proving that both Jews and Gentiles were under sin. This done, he showed them, in the second place, that Gentile philosophy provided them with no plan by which they might escape. Then, thirdly, that Judaism, or the law of Moses, was impotent to deliver them from their fallen condition. This, of course, enabled him to form the conclusion—if man will be saved, he must be saved by grace. They were not saved by works, or the deeds of their lives, for they were faulty. The word 'works' nowhere in the letter refers to the ordinance of baptism, but to the deeds of their past lives, or obedience to the law of

Moses. Nay, more, baptism belongs to the gospel scheme by which men must be saved. Hence, with Paul, it was the very opposite of justification by works or deeds of the law of Moses. Paul has the same thought in his letter to Titus (iii. 5). Having shown that we had not merited eternal peace by our conduct, he says: 'Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' Now, 'the washing of regeneration,' with one consent, is made to mean baptism, as though Paul had said, Not by works of righteousness, or by the deeds of our lives, are we in a saved condition, but by the mercy of the Saviour, we are saved from our sins by baptism, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit."

B.—"What do you mean by 'not justified by the deeds of their lives'? Is not baptism a deed?"

James—"Baptism is a deed; so is faith, so is calling upon the name of the Lord. But being saved by any or all of these is the poles apart from justification by works. If the deeds of a man were all of them righteous; if in nothing that he ever did, he had sinned—then the man might be said to be just before God in the light of his deeds. But Paul declares that we have all sinned, and come short of the glory of God. Hence, by works, or the deeds of our lives, no flesh can be saved. But God has had mercy upon us, and granted us salvation through the sacrifice of his Son. But this is appropriated to us by our choice; choosing

this salvation, and accepting it upon the terms presented by the Saviour, which are faith, repentance and baptism."

B.—"I will see you again to-morrow."

CHAPTER XXIX.

A GOOD MEETING—BRIGHT EXPERIENCES—NEED OF PRAYER—CORNELIUS AND SAUL PRAYED—A PETER WANTED—EVIDENCE OF PARDON—FEELING OR FAITH—WHICH THE SOURCE OF HAPPINESS—HOW APPROPRIATE GOD'S PROMISES—BAPTISM OF JOHN—WHAT FOR—THE COMMISSION, ETC.

The next day, Rev. Mr. Bonner called upon our friend at the usual time. "I regret," said he, "that you were not present last night at our meeting. I think you would have been ready to ask the prayers of the church, that you might have saving faith."

James—"I *have* saving faith. The only trouble is, I am not permitted to bow in obedience to its demands."

B.—"But, if you had heard some of the experiences that were told last night, you would have no further use for your theory of baptism for remission of sins. And my real opinion is, that we ought to have prayer-meeting in your house. You need the prayers of God's people much more than you do this dry, tedious argument."

James—"That is what the pedobaptists used to think, when I was investigating the subject of infant baptism, and also the action of baptism. It seems to me that you preachers have a convenient way of getting out of difficulties. When you

are unable to sustain your positions, you want to pray, right off. Now, sir, if you wish to come here and hold prayer-meeting, you are at perfect liberty to do so. But if you are undertaking this pious work, to pray me into the Baptist Church, or pray my brains out, so that I shall accept your theology without examination, you are likely to have your work for nothing."

B.—"Suppose that you try to obtain religion at the anxious-seat. It would certainly do you no harm."

James—"I shall do nothing in the direction of my salvation unless directed to do so by the word of God."

B.—"Are you not directed to pray? 'Pray always;' 'men ought always to pray,' etc., are the almost constant utterances of the word of God. He that asks shall receive. You see you must pray yourself as well as ask the prayers of the righteous, which avail much."

James—"You give the children's bread to dogs. What is the special right of the Christian, you apply to me. If you can find where the Saviour or the apostles instructed a sinner to pray, and to be prayed for, in order to pardon, I shall be willing to engage in it at once. But, unless you can find such instruction, I shall not undertake to get to heaven independent of the plan adopted by the Saviour. It would avail nothing whatever in my favor to follow any unscriptural guidance in the matter. Besides, as I can only have faith through the medium of testimony, and 'whatso-

ever is not of faith is sin,' it would be exceedingly sinful for me to do so."

B.—"Did not old Cornelius pray to God before he was a Christian? and did not God hear him?"

James—"Certainly; and God answered Cornelius, not by pardoning his sins unconditionally, or merely upon the condition of prayer, but he informed him where a man could be found who would tell him what he must do to be saved. But I do not feel that I am entitled to such a petition, for I have before me the answer that Peter gave to Cornelius and his house on the subject. And yet I wish from the bottom of my heart that God would send me a Peter, or, at least, let me know where one might be found, or some minister of the gospel who believes and practices as Peter did."

B.—"But did not Ananias tell Saul of Tarsus to call on the name of the Lord?"

James—"Ananias told Saul to 'arise, and be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord.' But I apprehend that, if Saul had refused to do what had thus been appointed for him to do, his calling upon the name of the Lord would not have availed him anything."

B.—"But how can you account for the unspeakable joy that persons receive in our meetings, if it is not God's answering their prayers by the remission of their sins?"

James—"The vilest sinners under the sun have these spells of joyfulness, or, at least, many have

them. But in your meetings the process is perfectly natural. You first arouse the mind as much as possible with the fear of death and eternal punishment. But when the mind has exhausted its strength in this torment, it naturally ceases to act as before. A calm comes over it; then, by your instruction, they are made to regard this quiet as an evidence of pardon and acceptance with God. Hence they rejoice in their supposition of having obtained a bright hope."

B.—"You think, then, that religion is devoid of feeling and enjoyment?"

James—"Not at all. But I do not think that feeling is an evidence of pardon."

B.—"Then, what evidence of acceptance with God have you left?"

James—"The promise of God."

B.—"In what way do you think that God's promises are made the surety of pardon and acceptance?"

James—"God has made it possible for us to be saved from our sins, and has told us plainly in his word what he demands of us in order to the remission of our sins. Thus, God having declared the terms of man's acceptance, when these terms are complied with, we have God's promise of pardon."

B.—"Have you no additional evidence?"

James—"No, sir; I was not aware that any man who believes the Scriptures to be inspired of God would want any additional security. God's word is sufficient for me."

B.—"This arrangement is rather too mechanical to suit me; it seems to be all of the head, but not from the heart."

James—"By what authority do you judge that those are less earnest and honest who hold, or may hold, the views that I do on this subject, than those who hold the views that you do? I have noticed that when a man gets into a tight place he is disposed to pass judgment upon his opponent, by saying that he is wanting in piety, or that his religion is void of enjoyment, or something of the kind. But my opinion is that it would be much more manly to show whereon such charges are founded, or else withdraw them."

B.—"I only spoke of how it seemed to me. Do n't lose your temper."

James—"My temper is not at all in danger. But what made it seem so to you?"

B.—"Because I can not see where your enjoyment in Christianity comes in."

James—"I can see how the enjoyment would be were I only privileged to obey my Master, that I might thereby appropriate his promises to myself. I could then draw near unto God in full assurance of faith, having my 'heart sprinkled from an evil conscience, and my body washed with pure water.' This, to me, would be a joy that would be real and lasting. No wonder that the jailer, after having been baptized, rejoiced, believing in God with all his house, or that the eunuch, after having been obedient to the faith, went on his way rejoicing. Their joy was the result of their evi-

dence of pardon which they had from the word of the Lord. But you have the order reversed; your evidence of pardon is in the fact that you have rejoiced."

B.—"We believe that where God works a work in man, it is not so insignificant that man can not know anything about it. And therefore we think that the evidence of our feelings is not to be despised or set at naught."

James—"I was not aware that pardon is performed within a man. I understand that sin is either a transgression of law or an omission of duty, and that pardon must therefore take place in the mind of God, against whom man has sinned. Hence I conclude that the only evidence that man can have that God has pardoned his sins is contained in his word."

B.—"And you will have this evidence when you are baptized; or, at least, think that you will?"

James—"Yes, sir; so I read the Scriptures, that Christ has demanded that we must believe in his name; that we must repent of our sins, and be baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; and that to these acts of submission to his will he has promised remission of sins."

B.—"I see plainly that there is no way to do anything with you except by showing you that your interpretation of the Scriptures, by which you make baptism essential to salvation, is not correct."

James—"Well, you might begin with the ministry of John, as you allow that it was Christian baptism. Zechariah said of John that he should give knowledge of salvation unto his people, by the remission of their sins. (Luke i. 17.) In Mark i. 4 we are informed that 'John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.' And to the same effect is Luke iii. 3. Now, you might show, as a kind of beginning in this matter, that Mark, Luke, Zechariah and John were mistaken."

B.—"I have no need of doing anything of the kind. James Cuggill is the mistaken man. Repentance was the term of pardon, into which the people were brought by the ministry and baptism of John."

James—"So you say; but Mark and Luke say to the contrary. They say he preached the *baptism of repentance* for the remission of sins. '*Of repentance*' is but a qualifying phrase, telling what kind of baptism it was. Or, that it might be still more plain, we might transpose it, and say repentance is *baptism* for remission."

B.—"I am not ready to accept your exegesis of those passages, though I do not see just how to answer it."

James—"Perhaps you might try your hand on the commission given by Matthew, Mark and Luke. Mark (xvi. 15) says: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned.' Here the terms are faith and

baptism, joined together, and that, too, by the Saviour himself."

B.—"The one term of salvation seems to be faith. For 'he that believeth not shall be damned.' It does not say, 'He that believeth not, and is not baptized, shall be damned.' So you see that all the stress is laid upon faith, and none whatever upon baptism."

James—"Suppose that the Saviour had said, 'He that believeth not, and is not baptized, shall be damned,' what would have been the result? In order to condemnation, a man would have to be without both faith and baptism. If he had ever been baptized, he could not be condemned, though he should afterward commit the unpardonable sin. That would be salvation by baptism only! I am glad that the Saviour never employed language of that kind. But, as it is utterly impossible to be baptized into Christ without faith, the absence of faith will be enough to secure condemnation. If faith, repentance and baptism are the terms of pardon, the absence of any one of them will leave the person without pardon, unless the plan laid down in the commission is passed by for the time. But, of course, faith is the first in order; condemnation would be predicated on its absence."

B.—"You think, then, if a man has only believed and been baptized, that he will be sure of everlasting felicity?"

James—"I have never assumed such a position. Indeed, I suppose that I should be about

the last man to take that position, and you ought to be about the last man to object to it. You believe that once in grace always in grace; but I do not. 'Be saved,' in Mark xvi., is 'remission of sins' in Luke xxiv. 47; hence these were the terms of remission of sins. But whether the man whose sins have been thus remitted will be saved eternally, depends upon his holding out faithful to the end—his overcoming, being steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord."

B.—"But salvation is so frequently predicated upon faith, without any mention of baptism whatever, that I can not see how baptism can have anything to do with the remission of sins."

James—"Have you not noticed also that, in these places in the gospel where salvation is predicated upon faith, without any mention of baptism, there is no mention of repentance! And will this fact prove that repentance has nothing to do with the plan of pardon?"

B.—"I think that repentance is always understood, because it is elsewhere mentioned."

James—"Baptism is elsewhere mentioned; may it not also be understood? Now, where we are said to pass from condemnation by believing on the name of the Son of God, the obedience which faith in Christ demands is always understood. Mankind were thus divided into two parties—believers and unbelievers. The believers are supposed to have had living faith, and hence not faith only. (Jas. ii. 20.)

B.—"How was it with the thief on the cross? Could he have been baptized? Was he not pardoned by faith only? and is not that case a rule for us?"

James—"The thief is not a rule for me, for the following reasons: 1. I am not a thief. 2. I am not likely to be put to death by crucifixion. 3. And, if I should, Christ will not be crucified by my side. 4. He was under the law of Moses, before the commission by which our salvation is provided was given. 5. His was a special case, and not according to my rule by which men are now to be pardoned. 6. Baptism was then an impossibility in his case. 7. He may have been one of John's disciples, but afterwards drawn away into former habits. Hence you can not find anything in his case that will affect the commission given by the Saviour. Its teaching is clear, and it becomes us to be obedient to its demands."

B.—"We will speak of this again to-morrow. In the meantime, attend our meetings. Good evening."

CHAPTER XXX.

ATTENDING THE MEETING—REV. MR. MELROY — THE
SERMON — THE MOURNERS — JANE SPEAKS TO THE
MOURNERS—INTERRUPTION—READS AGAIN—A SONG
—AN EXPERIENCE—ANOTHER EFFORT FOR SEEKERS
—DISMISSED — PRAISE AND BLAME — PROTRACTED
MEETING ENDED—PREACHERS GOING TO SEE JAMES
CUGGILL—HIS FATHER’S OPINION.

“My dear,” said James to his wife, “shall we go to church to-night? I have been thinking that I may be keeping you from enjoying those meetings. I forget, you see, that my troubles may be peculiar to myself.”

Jane—“I must say, dear, that I have entered into all your trials. Yet it has seemed proper to wait and see what would be the result of all this investigation. So far, I am sure that you have been correct with respect to the design of baptism. Since Mr. Bonner has been visiting us, I have looked as closely as I could at every passage in the New Testament in which the design of baptism was treated of, and have learned what I never knew before, that baptism, along with faith and repentance, is for the remission of sins. I think now that we have assisted each other in our theological difficulties, and perhaps we ought to do something in the way of teaching others the way of life. A number of persons are seeking the Lord at the anxious-seat who would certainly be glad to know what to do to be saved.”

James—"I do not know how we may have an opportunity of assisting any one in coming to the knowledge of the truth. It would certainly not do for me to say anything publicly, for already I am, in the estimation of Baptists and pe-dobaptists, the chief of sinners. My heterodoxy is a grievous burden to friends and foes. Still, I am willing to do anything that I can."

Jane—"We will go to-night, and perhaps a door of utterance will be opened up for us, so that we may be able to accomplish some good to some one."

They attended the meeting that night. Though they went at an early hour, they found the house quite full. They were engaged in a prayer-meeting, in which the new converts were quite conspicuous. The crowd kept increasing till nearly one-third of the number was unable to find seats. Rev. Mr. Melroy, from Bristol, England, being there, preached that night. His text was John iii. 3-5. When he arose he announced that he would preach on regeneration. The plan of his sermon was: 1. To show what was not regeneration. 2. To show what it was. 3. To impress their minds with the necessity of it. Under the first head he told them that regeneration was not of a transitory or migratory nature; before God regenerated a sinner, he counted the cost, so that if he ever had been, or ever would be regenerated, he could not ultimately be lost. In the second place, he told them that regeneration was entirely of God. In it man had no power to do anything. That it was in no

way the result of anything that might be done by any human being. Under the second head, he informed them that regeneration was the mysterious operation of the Holy Spirit, by which the sediment of human depravity is taken away, and the entire powers of the man are made to go out after God. Thus were people to be made new creatures, as mysteriously and incomprehensibly as the blowing of the wind. Under the third head, he gave them a rousing exhortation to come to Christ, to cast all their care upon him; and assured them that they need have no fears, for the Lord would have mercy upon them and save them. His exhortation was a powerful one, and at its close an invitation was given to come to the anxious-seat and seek for salvation. Perhaps not less than twenty-five or thirty persons went and knelt down at a low bench put at the base of the pulpit, and on two sides of it. Here preachers and members knelt and prayed several times. Several of the pious members told these struggling, penitent creatures how they might find peace; at least, how they had found peace.

Those who talked to the sinners did so by the invitation of Rev. Mr. Bonner. After calling for several exhortations and experiences, he called upon Mrs. Jane Cuggill to come and tell these sinners how to find Christ. At first she declined; but, after being importuned, she did so. She had taken the precaution to bring with her a copy of the New Testament Scriptures, which she opened and read to them, as follows:

“‘Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost’ (Matt. xxviii. 19).

“‘And said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned’ (Mark xvi. 15, 16).

“‘And he said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem’ (Luke xxiv. 46, 47).

“‘Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost’ (Acts ii. 37, 38.)”

Rev. Mr. Bonner here spoke in a tone indicating as much excitement as humility: “Sister Cuggill, we want no controversy.”

He was not alone in this holy fervor. Many of the members had shown, in their countenances, dissatisfaction at these Scripture readings. Only the mourners and outsiders seemed pleased with the reading. The seekers were sitting, clothed in their right minds, and heard the Word gladly.

"Let us pray," said Rev. Mr. Melroy; and all knelt in prayer but Jane and the seekers. The prayer was long and loud; and was, in point of thought and construction, a continuation and repetition of the sermon. God was asked to work wonders there just then, and save those sinners, that they might be kept from the wiles of the devil. The prayer was accompanied with such ejaculations from the saints as were supposed to be necessary to render the prayer effectual.

Jane had taken a seat during the prayer, but, as soon as the amen was pronounced, she arose and began reading to the seekers. "'But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women' (Acts viii. 12.) 'Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus. And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him' (Acts viii. 35-38)."

Some female voice just then began a song that was joined in by about one-fourth of the members. But the song, despite the choruses and repetitions, closed at last.

Again she read: "And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord' (Acts xxii. 16)."

Rev. Mr. Bonner asked "Mrs. Cuggill" to discontinue "those irrelevant readings. For," said he, "we want no confusion on this subject. These persons are seeking Christ, and you were invited to assist these seekers on their heavenly way. Now, if you have no word of comfort or instruction, I prefer that you will be seated."

Jane—"I was invited to show these persons how to find peace in Christ. I supposed that I could best do so by reading to them the teaching of Christ and the apostles on the plan of pardon. Yet, if our religion is endangered by being brought to the light of the Scriptures, I suppose I will have to desist."

Another rally was made for seekers to come to the anxious-seat; but they returned to their seats in the audience. Jane went back, too, and seated herself beside her husband.

The chagrin of both preachers was apparent to every one. After several unsuccessful attempts to call the seekers up again for prayers, Rev. Mr. Bonner announced that their protracted meeting was about to close. A gentleman rose up in the audience and said: "I have been seeking the pardon of my sins; I have been here at the anxious-seat every night for two weeks. And to-night I can say that I have found the way of salvation."

Both preachers and many of the older members thanked God, audibly. "Speak on, brother, and tell us how you found the Saviour," said Rev. Mr. Melroy.

The gentleman resumed: "I have heard to-night the question Scripturally answered that I have been asking ever since the meeting began: 'What must I do to be saved?' " But there was no vocal "thank God!" for that. "I am now ready to do what the Lord has commanded me; and, like the eunuch, I ask, What hinders me to be baptized?"

Rev. Mr. Bonner arose and said: "Let us look to the Lord and be dismissed." And he pronounced the benediction, perhaps *with some mental reservation!*

As soon as the people realized that they were dismissed, they began to gather in knots. Many of the leading members could not find language sufficiently severe in which to express their disapprobation of the course that had been pursued by Jane. Others failed to see what she had done that ought to be regarded as offensive. The seekers, especially, said that she had done what was right; that they had "learned more from the Scriptures that she had read that night, about the plan of pardon, than they ever knew before." It was a long time before they took their departure from the house.

Some way it became known that night that Rev. Mr. Bonner had been visiting the house of James Cuggill daily, to convince him of the neces-

sity of seeking for a miraculous change prior to his baptism, and that he had promised to visit there again on the following day, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

The next day Rev. Messrs. Bonner and Melroy both started on this pious errand. For, as Rev. B. said, it was no use for them to preach any more in that community, unless they could show their theology "to be able to withstand the assaults of a woman."

But on their way they were detained by meeting with Sir John Cuggill, who accosted them thus: "Brethren, where are you going?"

"To your son's," said Rev. B. "I feel that the Baptist Church here has been nearly ruined by the work of his wife last night. She certainly acted very imprudently."

Sir John C.—"Let me advise you now not to be too hasty in what you do; for I have found that she has the undivided sympathy of a majority of the church, and all the outsiders. Nothing but fair Scriptural investigation will do."

Rev. Mr. Melroy said he had met a great many persons in England that entertained her ideas of the plan of salvation, and he could easily settle the question.

CHAPTER XXXI.

THE TWO MINISTERS CENSURE MRS. CUGGILL—HER DEFENSE—SCRIPTURE EXEGESIS—ACTS II. 38; XXII. 16; X. 44-48—REGENERATION—SIMON THE MAGICIAN—PAUL NOT SENT TO BAPTIZE—THE TWELVE DISCIPLES AT EPHESUS—THE GREAT EXCITEMENT AND DETERMINATION FOR THE NEXT DAY.

The news of the intended visit had brought a large number of the young converts of the meeting, seekers and outsiders together at the house in advance of the preachers; and their presence evidently stimulated those ministers to the best efforts of which they were capable to make their doctrine look respectable.

After the salutations usual at such meetings, Rev. M. remarked: "We have come to talk over some spiritual matters that seem now to come in the way of success to the Lord's cause. I think, Sister C., that your conduct last night was very improper. Many brethren feel deeply aggrieved on account of what you did."

Jane—"I am sure that I had no evil intention. Having been called upon to point out to those seekers the way to Christ, and thinking the teaching of Christ and the apostles to be a safe guide, I read to them their inspired teaching on the subject."

B.—"Could you not see that your readings were giving offense to your brethren?"

Jane—"I thought probably some of the members might not like the word of God, but my anxiety in behalf of those seekers caused me to proceed."

B.—"I think that you were very much out of your place in your resuming your readings after the prayer offered by Bro. M. I think that you ought to make some public reparation for the offense."

James—"I am the cause of those readings, and can bear your complaints better than my wife can. Now, sir, the truth is this: you thought that Mrs. C. was a Baptist, with full faith in all your nonsense on the subject of salvation from sin, and that by her talk to those seekers you would control me by my love for my wife. And, further, my opinion is that if what you say is so, that this church is grieved at the reading of the Scriptures, you ought to be branded as a set of infidels. If she could have read the Scriptures that would have harmonized with your theological views on the subject of pardon, you would have been quite well satisfied. But, the Scriptures being against you, your sectarian intolerance had to invent a plan to prevent the word of God from being read."

M.—"I hope, Mr. C., that you will try and be courteous to a stranger by using language less severe."

James—"Since you manifest feeling, I will say that I have not tried to prevent your unmanly address to my wife, and now claim the right to give you a piece of my mind. Your prayer last

night did not seem to me to be prompted by any desire for communion with God, but (1) to get rid of the word of God, which was likely to leave your theology in bad working plight; and (2) to continue your argument on regeneration. Now, it occurs to me that a man who has no higher ideas of prayer than you appeared to have, has no right of petition whatever."

M.—"You are not my judge."

James—"That will not make your religious bigotry the less conspicuous."

M.—"I think, Bro. B., that these persons are joined to their idols, and we may as well let them go."

James—"We are to understand, then, that you regard our desire to follow the Scriptures as being joined to idols; and that you are the true worshippers of God while his word is an offense to you!"

B.—"Let me interpose. You forget that Scriptures may be read by scrapping them, so as to present a false idea of their teaching. That is just what Sister C. did last night."

James—"Would it not have been better for you to have shown, then, that these Scriptures were abused, than to have abused my wife for reading them?"

B.—"We did not want any controversy in the house of God."

James—"I have observed that when you have the right side of the question, as on the subject and action of baptism, you are free to controvert;

but when you are on the wrong side, controversy is an unholy thing. Your horror at the idea of controversy was excited by a sense of the weakness of your cause."

B.—"I will show you that the Scriptures were not fairly presented in those readings last night. The passage that looked most like baptism for remission is Acts ii. 38, which is made to depend for its strength on the preposition *for*, which by no means certainly means *in order to*, which it must mean to be of any assistance to your cause. In this case it probably means *because of*; at least, we know that the preposition *for* frequently has that meaning."

James—"Our preposition *for* has the meaning of '*on account of*,' or '*because of*,' very frequently, no doubt; but does the preposition *eis*, from which *for* is the translation in the passage, ever have that meaning?"

B.—"I can not say."

James—"Were they not told to repent for the same thing that they were to be baptized for?"

B.—"Yes, sir."

James—"Would Peter have told them to repent because their sins had been pardoned?"

M.—"I think that the pardon was evidently in the future when Peter told them to 'repent and be baptized,' but it was neither the repentance nor yet the baptism by which they should have remission, but 'in the name of Jesus Christ.' Proof of this may be found in the fact that they gladly received his word."

James—"No one doubts the fact that it was in the name of Christ that they should have pardon. There is no other name given under heaven among men, whereby we must be saved. But in what respect that affects the subject, I am unable to see. They had faith when Peter spoke to them the words in question. For (1) without faith they could make no approach toward Christ. See Acts x. 43; Heb. xi. 6; Rom. xiv. 23. 2. The people had every opportunity to believe. 3. They were pricked in their heart, which would not have been true if they had not believed. 4. They did what Peter told them to do, which is always the best possible proof of faith. Then they were not told to repent and be baptized in order to faith, but in order to the remission of sins. And, further, if the phrase 'for the remission of sins' had been left out, the meaning of the passage would be the same. The import of the question was, 'What shall we do to be saved?' or to have the remission of sins? Hence the directions given by Peter settle the question, provided we believe him."

M.—"Suppose we admit your position; then it will only prove the way of pardon for the Jews. We are Gentiles, and our plan of salvation may be very different. Indeed, we know, by reference to the tenth chapter of Acts, that a very different plan than that you think was taught on Pentecost is clearly revealed! These Gentiles were baptized with the Holy Spirit before they were commanded to be baptized in water."

James—"Does that prove that they were pardoned before they were baptized in water?"

M.—"Yes, unless you assume that alien sinners were baptized in the Holy Spirit!"

James—"Is there anything against such an assumption?"

M.—"It is not reasonable that God would send the Spirit to alien sinners."

James—"Why not?"

M.—"The Spirit is holy, and can only dwell in a holy place."

James—"Do you not teach that the Holy Spirit mysteriously and miraculously operates upon the sinner's heart in order to his conversion?"

M.—"But I understand that you do not accept that view."

James—"Let my view take care of itself. If you believe that the Holy Spirit regenerates the heart independent of any agency, then there is no reason why the unregenerate should not have the Spirit to come down upon them before they are regenerated, and hence before they are pardoned."

M.—"Be it so, then. But you will not be able to harmonize this occurrence with your views of remission."

James—"I do not see anything out of harmony. No Scripture ever taught that a miraculous operation of the Spirit should be regarded as an evidence of forgiveness. If the presence of miraculous power will prove acceptance with God, Caiaphas, the witch of Endor, Balaam, and the beast upon which he rode, were all children of

God! for they were in possession of miraculous power. This was probably true also of Judas Iscariot, for he was sent out along with the other apostles (see Matt. x.), and with power over unclean spirits and diseases; and yet he was a devil from the first."

M.—"Since you are expert in the Scriptures, suppose you tell us the purpose of the Holy Spirit's falling upon the house of Cornelius?"

James—"From Acts i. 8; ii. 33; Luke xxiv. 49; John xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7, it appears that the Holy Spirit came on the day of Pentecost to justify Christ before men, by declaring his innocence. This it did through the apostles, who were his witnesses. The Spirit guided them into the truth, by receiving the things of Christ and delivering them to his apostles, and by bringing all these things to their remembrance whatsoever Christ had spoken to them. It reproved the world of sin and righteousness and judgment, as it presented the truth through the apostles, accompanying the preaching at the same time with demonstrations of power, that the faith of men should not rest upon the wisdom of men, but upon the power of God. Hence its coming and presence should be the grand signal for the beginning of the work to which the Saviour had chosen them. All this is further evident from the introduction of Peter's first letter, where he declares that we were sanctified—set apart—unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, by the Spirit. It seems, then, that when the Spirit came

first, it sanctified the Jews to obedience, etc., and when it appeared the second time, it sanctified the Gentiles to obedience, in order that they might receive the benefit of the sacrifice of Christ. So Peter seems to understand it. Hence he asks his Jewish brethren whom he had brought with him, 'Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?' The baptism of the Holy Spirit at the house of Cornelius was a proof to Peter, not that they had been pardoned, but that the Spirit had set apart the Gentiles unto obedience, by which they might be saved; therefore he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."

M.—"I would like to have the proof that what these Gentiles were commanded to do had any part in bringing about their salvation."

James—"By reference to Acts x. 6 and xi. 14, we see that Peter was sent for to tell Cornelius what he must do that he and his house should be saved. When he came, he did tell them to be baptized. Is that proof?"

M.—"But is it not so, that the plan of salvation to the Gentiles is different from that which was sent to the Jews?"

James—"Let me ask you, gentlemen, if either of you ever preached to Jews?"

M.—"I have many times preached to audiences partly composed of Jews."

James—"Suppose one of those Jews had asked you what he should do to be saved; would you

have told him to 'repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins'?"

M.—"Well, perhaps not."

James—"Then, according to your own argument, you and Peter differ on the plan of pardon."

M.—"I think that we may confine ourselves to what is the plan of salvation to the Gentiles. This is most certainly the only question that concerns us!"

James—"I have never been able to see any difference between Jew and Gentile in this matter. They are all under sin; all need the sacrifice of Christ; and how it would be possible for Divine Justice to save them differently, I am unable to tell.

"1. Christ 'is our peace' (Eph. ii. 14). He came into the world that in him we 'might have peace' (John xvi. 33). 'The word which God sent to the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; (he is Lord of all;)' (Acts x. 36), is the same that was sent unto the Gentiles. 'For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.' Now, for Christ to inaugurate one plan of salvation for the Jews and a very different one for the Gentiles, would be to lay the foundation of an unending strife between them. And that he did so is perfectly irreconcilable with the idea of Christ's having come to

make peace and establish good will upon the earth among men.

"2. The Scriptures nowhere intimate that there is any difference between Jews and Gentiles in the plan adopted for their salvation.

"3. The Scriptures teach abundantly that there is no difference between Jew and Gentile. 'God put no difference between them and us,' said Peter, in the council at Jerusalem. (Acts xv. 7-9.) 'For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek, for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him,' says Paul to the Roman brethren. (Rom. x. 12.) In chapter iii. 21, 22, he had already said, "But now the righteousness of the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference.' Again, when Paul writes to the Colossians, he says: 'There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all, and in all' (Col. iii. 11). Gal. iii. 28 is to the same effect. Indeed, it would be a task to quote all the Scriptures that assure us, in the plainest possible manner, of the incorrectness of the idea that there is one plan of salvation for the Jews and another for the Gentiles.

"4. We have already seen by the introduction of the gospel to the Gentiles, that they were required to do the same things that were demanded of the Jews. This much we have seen in the case

of the household of Cornelius. And, further, we might see the same things in the conversion of all Gentiles recorded in the Acts of the Apostles.

"5. The commission given by the Saviour to the apostles was not for the Jews any more than for the Gentiles. It determined the plan of salvation for all men: it went to 'all nations'; to 'every creature'; 'unto the uttermost parts of the earth.' Hence it was utterly impossible for them to preach one plan of pardon or of salvation to the Jews, and another to the Gentiles."

M.—"Saul of Tarsus was pardoned through prayer."

James—"Was he also pardoned without baptism?"

M.—"I think that baptism had nothing to do with his remission whatever."

James—"Why do you think so?"

M.—"Because he was commanded to 'wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord.'"

James (turning to his wife)—"Dear, will you just read the passage?"

Jane—"I read from Acts xxii. 16: 'And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.'"

M.—"But you see that 'wash away thy sins' is active, while 'be baptized' is passive. Hence, as a man is not active and passive at the same time, 'be baptized' could have no connection with the removal of sins."

James—"Did Paul wash away his sins by prayer? If so, who pardoned him?"

M.—"God pardoned him; but he put himself, by prayer, into the required condition to receive pardon."

James—"Have we not precisely the same evidence that he came into this required condition by baptism?"

M.—"In his baptism he was to be passive."

James—"I apprehend that in the remission of his sins he was equally passive. And yet, in his baptism, he had to be active in submitting to be passive. Here is the truth of the whole matter: Saul had been praying for three days and nights. Ananias does not tell him to discontinue his prayer, but to 'arise, and be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord.'"

M.—"I can prove to you that baptism is no part of the plan of pardon to the Gentiles."

James—"I should prefer your proof to your repeated promises."

M.—"Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles, and, as such, he was sent 'to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified' (Acts xxvi. 18). This is positive proof that whatever was necessary to be done in order that the Gentiles might be pardoned, Paul was to do. Now read I. Cor. i. 17: 'For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach

the gospel.' Paul was sent to do all that was necessary in order to the pardon of their sins, but he was not sent to baptize; therefore, baptism was no part of the plan of salvation, as Paul understood and preached it."

James—"Paul did baptize some. See verses 14, 15 and 16. Did he act without any authority? And why was Paul thankful that he had not baptized any more of them than he had? 'Lest any should say that he had baptized in his own name.' If baptism was regarded as a matter of no consequence, how should it make any difference who did the baptizing? or whether or not he had baptized in his own name? It may be that, in the seventeenth verse, Paul simply refers to his personal work, and the division of labor between himself and companions. When Paul was alone he did the baptizing; but when Silas and Timotheus, or Barnabas and John, or Mark, were with him, he seems to have left this work to them, while he reserved his strength for the preaching of the Word."

M.—"I do not remember of any account of Paul being alone at the time of a baptism."

James—"I remember that he found some persons who had only gone about as far as you have, whom he took and baptized."

M.—"I would like to have the reference."

James—"It is Acts xix. 1-5, and reads: 'And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus: and finding certain disciples, he

said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Spirit since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Spirit. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.' ”

M.—“It is not clear that those persons were baptized a second time. And if they were, it was because they had not been properly prepared for the former baptism, by having received the Holy Ghost.”

James—“Paul did not ask them if they had received the Holy Spirit before they were baptized, but after they had been baptized.”

M.—“At any rate, then, they were disciples without having a proper baptism.”

James—“A disciple is a learner. There were disciples of Moses, but they were not Christians. If all who have been baptized unto John's baptism were as anxious to know and do the will of the Lord as those were that Paul found at Ephesus, they would be better entitled to the name ‘disciple.’ We have found that Paul never neglected nor delayed the baptism of any one that was prepared to be baptized; baptizing Lydia and her household the same day, the jailer and his household the same hour of the night. And whether

we shall find that he administered with his own hands or not, his estimation of its necessity remains clear; for it was always attended to without delay."

B.—"Why does Peter say that baptism is merely the answer of a good conscience?"

James—"I was not aware that Peter ever said that."

B.—"You ought to read Peter's first Epistle, and be posted."

James—"I have read it several times, but never saw what you quoted."

M.—"I will read you the passage. I. Pet. iii. 20, 21: 'Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.'"

James—"But you were to find where it says that baptism is *merely* the answer of a good conscience. What Peter says is right, but I object to your interpolation—*merely*."

M.—"Well, if baptism is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, it is not for the remission of sins, for Peter has reference to the sins instigated by our fleshly nature, by 'filth of the flesh.'"

James—"How do you know that Peter had reference to sins when he said 'filth'?"

M.—"In Col. ii. 11 Paul expresses the same thought by denominating it 'the body of the sins of the flesh.' And in II. Cor. vii. 1 he speaks directly to the point: 'Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.'"

James—"Col. ii. 11 is a very plain statement of baptism for remission, when read in its connection. Let us read it in connection with the next verse: 'Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.' But if you are right in II. Col. vii. 1, referring to sins instigated by our fleshly nature, then what does filthiness 'of the spirit' mean?"

M.—"Paul has furnished an illustration from the ancient Israelites, who were not to touch any one that was unclean. (See chap. vi. 15-18.) But, if they did, they had to go through a legal purification. So Paul teaches them to have no fellowship with infidels or idolaters. This coming in contact with such putrescent sinners is what he styles filthiness of the flesh. And to imitate them, follow their ways, drink in their spirit, would be filthiness of the spirit. Hence he says, 'Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean.'"

James—"Was not a bath in water the last thing in order in being cleansed from legal defilement?"

M.—"We must not press figures too far. These Corinthians were Christians; had all been washed

(I. Cor. vi. 11); but they were to cleanse themselves by refusing to have any fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness."

James—"Then what did Peter mean by saying 'not the putting away the filth of the flesh'? Was baptism for these Christians? and was it refusing to keep company or mingle in the society of men of the world?"

M.—"You can ask more questions than Solomon could answer."

James—"I wanted you to see what injustice your reasoning was doing to the Scriptures. And now, is not this the meaning of Peter's language: Baptism is not to take the place of the legal bath of the law of Moses, nor yet the exercise of conscience toward Moses, but toward Christ?"

Deacon Marvin, who had been present all the time during the conversation, said:

"Brethren, I think that Mr. Cuggill has the meaning of the passage. I see the following objections to Bro. M.'s reasoning on I. Pet. iii. 20, 21: 1. Peter was probably writing to those brethren who had been discipled in Jerusalem, and, perhaps, a great number of them on the day of Pentecost (see I. Pet. i. 1, 2, compared with Acts viii. 1), who had been told by this same Peter to 'repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.' And the thought that Peter would ever tell them, or any one else, that baptism was not for the remission of sins, is to me beyond the precincts of reason. 2. Peter says, 'Baptism doth also now save

us' (verse 21). And to suppose that he would then contradict it, in the same sentence, requires too much doubt with respect to Peter's common sense, to say nothing of his inspiration. 3. Those disciples from among the Jews might easily be persuaded, by Judaizing teachers, that the ordinances appointed by Christ were but a continuation of those found in the law; hence the parenthesis."

Just then a servant announced that tea was ready. James invited all his visitors to take supper with him; and, after much persuasion, they were all helped to plenty of the necessities and luxuries of life at two long tables arranged in his large dining-room. About the time that supper was over, a great number—mostly members of the Baptist Church in Cardigan—arrived, wishing, if possible, to hear the Scripture investigation.

Rev. Messrs. Melroy and Bonner thought that they would have to go; but the people urged them to stay. Finally they all returned to the parlor, which was enlarged by the removal of folding-doors between it and the family sitting-room. And there sat down not less than sixty persons to hear the Scriptures read, and to ask and answer questions.

B.—"I think that there are references in the Epistles that are quite irreconcilable with the idea that baptism is for the remission of sins. In Heb. x. 22 Paul evidently refers to baptism; but, before they were baptized, they had their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience."

James—"Please read the verse."

B.—"Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.'"

James—"The figure is taken from the tabernacle service; and as the priests had to have blood sprinkled upon them, and be washed in the laver, before they might come into the holy place, so Paul assures us that we have had our hearts sprinkled and our bodies washed. But, if the baptism had nothing to do with the remission of sins and acceptance with God, Paul would not have referred to it as the ground of confidence with which we should approach unto a throne of favor. But this is not the only passage in which baptism is referred to under the figure of a washing. In Eph. v. 25, 26 Paul says: 'Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.' Here the church is said to be '*sanctified and cleansed by the washing of water,*' or by baptism. I. Cor. vi. 11: 'But such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.' Here the order is clear; before they were sanctified, or set apart in the service of the Lord, by which they were justified, they were said to be washed—baptized. By baptism we are brought into Christ and put on Christ. Paul says: 'For as many of you as have been bap-

tized into Christ, have put on Christ.' Rom. vi. 3 is to the same effect. And, further, the dying to sin, being buried with Christ in baptism, and arising to walk in newness of life (Rom. vi. 3, 4), is what Paul denominates obeying 'that form of doctrine which was delivered unto you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness' (Rom. vi. 17, 18)."

M.—"I can not see what connection baptism is designed to have with the pardon of sins. Baptism has to do with the body; sin affects the soul. How, then, my dear sir, is it possible for baptism to have anything to do with remission of sins?"

James—"I presume that you could not see the connection between blowing on trumpets made of rams' horns and the leveling of the walls of Jericho, or between the Israelite looking upon the brazen serpent and being healed from the bite of the fiery serpent in the wilderness. But what of it? It is not baptism that pardons; not faith, not repentance, but God; and these are terms upon which God had proposed to accept of the sinner. Sin is not something that is fastened to a man's soul, any more than it is fastened to his back, as Mr. Bunyan had it. Sin is a transgression of law, or an omission of duty; and pardon takes place in the mind of God, and not in the breast of the sinner."

M.—"I think that your theory attaches too much importance to human conduct."

James—"I would prefer a 'thus saith the Lord' to what you can or can not think. The question is, 'What say the Scriptures?'"

M.—"I perceive that you do not believe in regeneration. I should think that my sermon last night would have been sufficient to fix your mind on that subject, but you do not seem to have understood it."

James—"A great deal of it, I presume, was not understood by any one, unless by its author. Your text said a man must be born of water and the Spirit in order to enter the kingdom of God; but your sermon said that the new birth had nothing to do with water!"

M.—"Did I not show from the case of Simon the magician (Acts viii. 23) that, though he had been baptized, he had never been pardoned?"

James—"No, sir. And, if you had, you would have found not only that baptism was not in order to justification, but also that faith is not in order to pardon, for he had believed. See verse 13. In the second place, you misquoted the Scripture, reading it, 'Thou art *still* in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity;' whereas, it should have read, 'Thou art *in*,' etc.; not '*still in*,' as you read it. Now, my opinion of a cause that compels its advocates to misquote the word of God is a bad one; and the man that will misquote it purposely, is dishonest!"

M.—"Well, sir, I do not care to be insulted any further. You have not been appointed judge of my conscience!"

James—"You need not apply the language to yourself unless you are guilty. That you did misquote the language we all know; but that you did it purposely could only be known to yourself."

M.—"I have just one more question for you, and then I am going. Do you believe that baptism is any part of regeneration?"

James—"It is owing to what you call regeneration. If you only have reference to the changes effected in the mind, known as faith and repentance, I say no, for both of these must precede the baptism. But if you refer to all that is necessary to bring the sinner into the covenant of Christ, then, surely, baptism is present, according to the teachings of the Saviour and the apostles upon the subject."

M.—"Just refer us to the teaching of some one of the apostles on the subject of regeneration, where your ideas are supported!"

James—"The only place where the word 'regeneration' occurs in the apostolic writings is in Paul's letter to Titus (iii. 5): 'Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' I believe that all commentators of any note are agreed that the washing of regeneration, or of the new birth, has reference to baptism; as though Paul had said, 'Not that we have earned salvation by having always done our duty, but according to his mercy he saved us by baptism.'"

M.—"I see that you are an unregenerated man and can not understand the things of the Spirit, and I have no more time to waste with you."

So saying, he put on his greatcoat and departed in company with Rev. Mr. Bonner.

John Sparks, who had been a seeker during the last meeting, then arose and asked what were the qualifications of an administrator of baptism. He desired to obey the Saviour in baptism, but could not have the privilege of doing so in the Baptist Church, because he was disposed to follow the word of the Lord, rather than the traditions of men. A great many others expressed themselves to the same effect; and, after many suggestions, they agreed to meet there the next day at 10 o'clock, having searched the Scriptures in the meantime on that subject, and, if any one among them should be found with the necessary qualification to baptize, a number would be baptized.

CHAPTER XXXII.

GREAT EXCITEMENT — WONDERFUL STORIES — HARSH MEASURES PROPOSED—RADICALISM, OR CONSERVATISM?—ILL-DIRECTED RAGE—ALL GO TO THE BAPTIST CHURCH — CAN ANY CHRISTIAN BAPTIZE? — WAIT FOR COVENANT MEETING — GREAT CHANGE! JUST WANT TO BE CHRISTIANS!—THE PROPOSITION ACCEPTED—COMMITTEE APPOINTED.

How news will travel! But, of all news, none can out-travel or outgrow religious news! Some way it got out that the next day a great many persons were to meet at the residence of James Cuggill and baptize each other; that some one would baptize some one else, and then that one would baptize all the rest. Others had it that James was about to institute a new religion, and establish himself at the head of a new party, who would have all ministerial authority in derision, and hold in contempt the decisions of any and all men in matters of religion, except those who would unite with them. And still others heard it—direct, of course—that Mrs. Jane Cuggill was going to do the baptizing! So the stories ran, and so the excitement increased.

Early next morning there were to be seen, in the city and out of it, everywhere throughout the surrounding country (for the news had traveled at a wonderful rate, and increased its bulk and weight at every step) groups and knots of people, as they were talking learnedly and piously of the

new heretical fanaticism! Some thought that there should be official intervention; that the officers of the law should interpose in behalf of good order, and prevent those persons from disgracing themselves and humanity generally. Some zealous members in the Baptist Church were heard to speak thus harshly. Others were more sparing of their execrations, saying, "Refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this counsel, or this work, be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye can not overthrow it, lest haply ye be found to fight against God." Some wag ventured to say that if they should venture to do anything as foreign to propriety and decency as some things that had occurred during the revival meeting just closed, they might talk of restraining them by the force of law! But wags will have their say.

The leading members of the Baptist Church were exercised in no small degree at the thought of so many of their members being involved in the new movement. Harsh measures were proposed, which, perhaps, would have been adopted but for the fact that they could possibly do no good.

Rev. Mr. Melroy, who yet remained with them, assured them that their only safety would be to get rid of those dissatisfied and disaffected members at once. Rev. Mr. Bonner was of the opinion that if the Cuggills and Freemans, and those who would be controlled by their influence, were to be dismissed from Baptist moorings, the very

existence of the church would be endangered. Hence he proposed that all who would meet the next day at James Cuggill's should postpone their investigation of the subject, "Who may baptize?" for two days, and meet with them at their regular covenant meeting, when the Baptist Church would consider the question of experience-telling prior to baptism. In this way he hoped to conciliate them, and, instead of dividing the church, increase its numbers and power. Nothing, however, was adopted as a plan of work. Many would have killed the movement by letting it alone, but it was evident that it would not die from that kind of treatment.

How completely Satan outdevils himself sometimes. Many persons had become interested in the discussion of these subjects, on account of ill-directed rage. But in the false talk of that night and morning the number was increased to hundreds; and a full hour before the time appointed for the meeting, the people were coming, as it were, in battalions and regiments, either "to see a reed shaken with the wind" or "to hear some new thing." The day was damp and chilly, and, as there was not room enough in the residence of James to accommodate more than a fourth of the people, they accepted an invitation from Rev. Mr. Bonner to adjourn to the Baptist Church, where the most of them might be comfortably seated.

After they were in the Baptist Church it was thought proper to call upon some one to act as

moderator; and, on motion, Mr. Carnes, a leading member of the Baptist Church, who was somewhat in sympathy with the movement, was called to the chair. On assuming the responsibilities of that position, he made a few timely remarks respecting the purpose of the meeting, and the manner in which they ought to conduct themselves during the proposed investigation.

Mr. Sparks rose and said: "I have been looking over the Scriptures since our meeting yesterday, and have noticed a few things to which my mind had never been called before:

"1. John's baptism was from heaven, and not from men. God sent him to baptize; hence he neither had nor needed such an ordination as is now generally supposed to be an essential to an administrator of that ordinance.

"2. 'Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples.' These were not apostles, for the choosing of apostles occurred a long time after this. Hence their right to baptize was put upon the ground of their discipleship.

"3. The disciples that were scattered abroad on account of the persecution recorded in the seventh and eighth chapters of Acts, went everywhere, preaching the Word. And, judging from the account given of one of them—Philip—it is but reasonable to suppose that they baptized.

"4. Ananias, who baptized Saul of Tarsus, is known in the Scriptures simply as a disciple of Christ.

"5. The six brethren who accompanied Peter from Joppa to Cæsarea evidently did the baptizing, as may be seen from the last verse of the tenth chapter of Acts. They seem to have been Jews who had been converted to Christianity, and were living in Joppa. And it is hardly within the range of possibility that they were all of them ordained ministers of the gospel.

"6. Apollos, who had no acquaintance with the disciples of Christ till he came to Ephesus, baptized, and yet Paul finds no fault with the baptism of those Ephesians on account of the administrator.

"7. The church of Rome seems to have been built up by those who were discipled on the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem, who returned to Rome and preached the gospel to their fellow citizens."

Rev. Mr. Bonner made the following remarks:

*"Brethren, Neighbors and Friends:—*I think that the present meeting is entirely uncalled for. All persons who desire to obey the Saviour can certainly find an opportunity of doing so in the Baptist Church. It is evident that you are trying to serve the Lord, and, had you been willing to state to the church the emotions and desires which you seem to have, there is no reason to believe that you would have been refused the privilege of being baptized. I could wish, therefore, that you would adjourn your meeting to our covenant meeting, and there express yourselves, in the hearing of the church, concerning your trials and desires. And I think that you have no cause of fear

that the church will refuse to offer you a home. This course will be wise, from several considerations:

“1. It will save us from that strife that always grows out of division.

“2. It will save you from that persecution that always comes upon any new religious movement.

“3. It will save you from the necessity of the doubtful course of being baptized by one who has never been ordained to that work. I should think that nothing but extreme necessity should cause you to be baptized by any one but an ordained minister.”

James Cuggill then arose and spoke to the audience as follows:

*“Neighbors and Friends:—*This meeting is a peculiar one. It has grown out of a terrible necessity. I have asked to be baptized and have been refused for the want of an experience in sights and sounds, frames and feelings, such as people are accustomed to recite in uniting with the Baptist Church. Quite a number here are in ‘the same condemnation.’ Not only so, but both of the preachers present to-day have been informed with respect to my mental condition, and have decided that I am not fit to be baptized, being yet in an unregenerate state. In the speech of Mr. Bonner, however, there is a different tone. Why such an unregenerate person as I am should all at once become acceptable to the Baptist Church is more than I can comprehend. To one who knows no better, it may serve to lessen the interest in the

present examination. But, whatever may have been the intent of his speech, he proceeds with the thought that about all any of us can desire is membership in the Baptist Church. Now, I apprehend that membership in any organization of the day is a very secondary consideration. What we have desired is to become Christians, not Baptists, not Episcopalians, not Presbyterians, but simply Christians."

Rev. Mr. Bonner said: "I do not care to protract any controversy, and therefore, whatever may have occurred in the past, I am willing that it should belong to the past. Our meeting, in two days from this, will be open for the consideration of all such questions as will necessarily come up before us to-day. I hope, therefore, that you will adjourn till that time."

Mr. Sparks—"This audience certainly feels grateful to Mr. Bonner for the privilege of meeting in this house to-day, but we are under no obligation to adjourn a minute sooner than if we were assembled anywhere else. Nor do I see that our movements ought in any way to be regulated by Baptist usages. The regular time for covenant meeting is no more a proper time to consider this question than the present. I hope, therefore, that kind words will not prevent us from accomplishing the object for which we have met. We were to decide, if possible, to-day, 'who may baptize?' Now, I think it is plain, from the teaching of the word of God, that any Christian may, when circumstances demand it, baptize. If there is no dissent

from what we have said upon this, I think we might as well adopt it as the sentiment of the present meeting."

Rev. Mr. Bonner said that he hoped they would not act rashly or hastily in adopting anything of the kind. "I am willing to admit," said he, "that *necessity* may make it proper enough for an ordained Christian to baptize, but I deny that any such necessity now exists. The people of God are here in regular working order, with an ordained ministry. Hence, if you desire to obey Christ, this is your Heaven-appointed way."

Mr. Carnes, the chairman, arose and said: "Dear brethren, the hour of 12 is upon us. I suggest the propriety of adjourning the meeting till some hour this afternoon."

Sir George Freeman (rising in his seat)—"Brother chairman, I hope that we will *do something first*, looking to a permanent settlement of this question. There are a good many members of this church that are dissatisfied with the usages and teaching of the Baptist denomination, and, under the present system of things, can not be retained in the organization any longer. I therefore move that a committee of ten be appointed by the Chair, five of whom are in favor of the movement here to-day, and the other five from those who are satisfied with the present order of things, whose duty it shall be to confer together and to draft articles of agreement by which this division may be healed, and present the same to this body at its next coming together."

This motion was unanimously adopted. The chairman then asked those who were dissatisfied with the doctrine and usages of the Baptist Church to rise, and, to the astonishment of all, more than three-fourths of all the members present stood up. This division enabled the chairman to appoint the committee, which he did, with Sir George Freeman foreman on the dissenting side, and Rev. Mr. Bonner on the other.

Then they adjourned to meet in the same place the next day, at 2 o'clock.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

MEETING AND WORK OF THE COMMITTEE — CHARITY NECESSARY TO UNITY—ARE CREEDS IN THE WAY OF UNION?—IS THE WORD OF GOD A SUFFICIENT RULE?—IS THE NAME “BAPTIST” A PROPER NAME FOR ANY AND EVERY DISCIPLE?—IT IS IN THE SCRIPTURE—SO IS PHARISEE—CLOSE COMMUNION—THE LORD’S SUPPER — CHURCH OFFICERS — FINAL PERSEVERANCE — UNCONDITIONAL ELECTION — EXPERIENCE—TELLING—OPERATION OF THE SPIRIT — NO DELAY IN BAPTIZING — SHARP CONTROVERSY — ARTICLES ADOPTED, AND SOME THIRTY PERSONS ARE BAPTIZED.

The committee met that afternoon at the residence of Sir George Freeman. They remained in council till midnight. By invitation of Mr. F., they lodged there during the remainder of the night. At 5 o’clock in the morning they went into council again, in which they remained (excepting the time occupied in taking breakfast and dinner with Mr. F.) till it was time to start to the meeting. Their resolutions had been drawn up with care, in the following paper, which Mr. F. read to the very large audience that had assembled :

“Your committee have had the points of difficulty under advisement, and have concluded that all practices and doctrines for which there can not be found a *direct* ‘thus saith the Lord’ or apostolic precedent, shall not be made obligatory upon any

one; that all things else, either in teaching or custom, *may and should be* sacrificed for that unity for which our Master labored and prayed and died. We append a few items of sacrifice, and suggest, with respect to each, a common ground of unity, where we may fraternize without the loss of any Scripture teaching:

“I. It is objected that our articles of faith and rules of decorum are, without any Scripture warrant, imposed upon the saints.

“And, further, that the very existence of articles of faith, independent of the Scriptures, is an implied denial of the sufficiency of the Scriptures, as taught by Paul in II. Tim. iii. 16, 17.

“And, further, that in these church usages there is much of tradition that is in antagonism to the word of God; and, in the articles of faith, doctrines are taught that are nowhere found in the Scriptures, and that are contrary to them.

“And, further, as it should be one of the great objects of Christian labor to unite all believers in one body by the cross of Christ; as division-makers are declared, in the word of God, to be sensual, not having the Spirit; are said to be heretical, from whom fellowship should be withdrawn; that they serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own appetites; that they are carnal and walk as men; and that they shall not inherit the kingdom of God; and, as our articles of faith and rules of decorum, which are peculiar to Baptists, stand in the way of that union which the Scriptures everywhere teach:

"Therefore these articles of faith and rules of decorum should be laid aside; so that, if any ask us for our articles of religion and church usages, we can simply point to the Scriptures as our only rule of faith and practice.

"II. The name 'Baptist' as a church cognomen is without any divine authority; it stands in the way of union; supports sectarian prejudices and jealousies, and should therefore be laid aside for those Scripture appellations in the use of which all may participate who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. As the name 'Baptist' is not essential to our purity or piety, we therefore recommend that its use, as a church cognomen, be discontinued."

A voice from the audience:—"We may be called Pharisees—that is a Scripture name!"

F.—"For the relief of my brother, I will remark that 'Pharisee,' as a title for the followers of Christ, has only about the same authority that 'Baptist' has! What we have proposed is that we appropriate to ourselves only such names as did the first Christians.

"III. Close communion is a ground of offense. Now, as the Scriptures nowhere authorize Baptist or any other kind of sectarian communion, we therefore recommend that it shall cease to be practiced among us, and that we will allow all children of God to eat with us.

"IV. It is thought that primitive Christians met on every first day of the week to break bread, and that their practice should furnish a rule for us

in that respect. See Acts xx. 7; 1. Cor. x. 21-24; xi. 21-23; xvi. 1, 2. Of this, however, your committee has nothing to suggest, except that, in the future, we will be guided by the word of God on that subject.

“V. A more Scriptural organization of the church is desired than that which now obtains among us. From all we have been able to learn from the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, every individual congregation had a plurality of bishops and overseers, sometimes called elders, and also a plurality of deacons, or servants. It is proposed that we in the future have a plurality of these officers.”

A voice from the audience:—“I would like to know what any form of church government has to do with the piety of individual members?”

F.—“I will say, in reply, the Holy Spirit received the things of Christ and delivered them unto the apostles, and hence what the apostles did and recommended with respect to church officers can not be disregarded; and, unless we can claim a wisdom superior to that which the apostles spoke, we must allow that the form of church government contained in the Acts and Epistles is that by which we must be guided.

“VI. It is thought that the doctrine of once in grace always in grace, and the doctrine of unconditional election to everlasting life, are not taught in the Scriptures, and should not be forced upon our people.

“VII. The practice of voting on the fitness of candidates for baptism is unsupported by the Scriptures. It is desired, therefore, that the practice will go entirely into disuse.

“VIII. We are only sure of the Holy Spirit’s operation upon the sinner’s heart through the medium of the word of truth. And, though the committee have not been able to agree in every respect concerning the Spirit’s operation in the conversion of the world, we did agree with respect to the point to be reached, and our duty in the premises. The point to be reached is faith that works by love and purifies the heart; and, to this end, it is our duty to cause the gospel to be preached, asking God’s blessing upon our labors.

“IX. We have not been able to agree with respect to the precise point at which the sinner is pardoned. Some of us think that it is always at the point of faith; others think that pardon follows baptism. But we were agreed that the duties of faith, repentance and baptism are binding upon sinners on coming into the kingdom. It is therefore suggested that, whatever may be our views upon the subject, we will only insist on others holding the same views with us as we may be able to speak of in the express language of the Scriptures.

“X. We think it proper to ask no more of one desiring baptism than was asked by the apostles, and, when that is answered, to baptize them without further delay. This seems all the more reasonable as we realize that the apostles and primitive

Christians required them to believe with all the heart that 'Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God.'

"There were some slight differences in other matters, but of such a nature as to be powerless for any evil whatever; and it is hoped that these suggestions will meet with your approval, and that we may have peace and unity."

Rev. Mr. Melroy arose and said: "I am surprised and grieved at this document. This will be schism on a large scale to prevent it on a small scale. You will be separating yourselves from the Baptist Church entirely, simply to retain within your own embrace a few restless, unregenerated men and women; you will be opening the flood-gates of iniquity, making this church into a Pandora's box, in which will be deposited all the putridity of this unregenerate age. I hope you will not do such a foolish thing as to give heed to these suggestions. Rev. Mr. Bonner must have been sound asleep, to allow such things as these articles to grow up right under his nose!"

When Rev. Mr. Melroy took his seat, several persons began calling upon Rev. Mr. Bonner. He arose and said:

"We must confess that many of these suggestions are not such as I would have drawn up; still I believe that the platform of unity therein suggested is the only one on which it is possible for us to have peace. Besides, they do not propose any real change in principle. I think, therefore, that we will do well to adopt them. We can

hardly suffer anything by yielding our articles of faith and rules of decorum for the word of God."

Rev. M.—"I want to ask one question right here. How will men know what you believe?"

B.—"I will answer that by asking another question: How much more plain and perspicuous are our articles of faith than the revelations which God made? If we have not been able to express ourselves more to the comprehension of our fellows than God did, then men can know just as well what we believe when we tell them that we believe the Bible as though we told them that we believed some other book."

M.—"I see it is all very nice to pretend to believe only the word of God, but your faith will not be in the word of God, any more than will the faith of any one else. There will only be this difference: while the faith of all is in their interpretation of the word of God, others have their interpretations written and printed, while you will have yours in your heads!"

B.—"No doubt Bro. M. thinks so, but if the Bible is as plain and as easily understood as our articles of faith are, then it no more needs interpretation than our articles do. We can therefore lose nothing in this change but what is doubtful, and can get nothing in return except that which is certain."

M.—"I would ask Mr. Bonner if he prefers to become a leader of the new heresy, and to be ostracized by Regular Baptists everywhere, or has

he taken into account what he is bringing upon himself in defending this way?"

B.—"I have been trying to heal divisions rather than make them. If the Baptists choose to put us from them simply because we are willing to lay down the traditions of men for the infallible word of God, then let them ostracize; they will be guilty of the separation, not we."

Mr. Freeman—"I would like to ask Bro. M. if anything may be religiously right and Scripturally wrong at the same time." To which M. said "No." "Then I would like to put another question: Can anything be religiously wrong and Scripturally right at the same time?" Again M. said "No." "Well, then, the question is not, what will the Baptists do, but what does God require us to do? If these suggestions are not in keeping with the word of God, let us reject them; if they are, let us accept them."

Mr. Carnes then asked the audience of their pleasure concerning the suggestions.

A motion was made to abide by the plan for reconciliation recommended, and, after some further discussion, it was almost unanimously adopted, some four only voting in the negative. Rev. Mr. Melroy left in a rage, threatening them with the Baptist Association.

Rev. Mr. Bonner then asked all who desired to be baptized upon a profession or confession of their faith to come forward; to which more than thirty responded, James Cuggill with the rest. These made the simple confession which Christ

has demanded and upon which he placed his blessing. They went the same hour and were buried in baptism. And the next Lord's Day, before they engaged in breaking bread in memory of the Saviour's broken body and the shed blood, they had the right hand of fellowship extended to them. They then took their places in the congregation of the saints, determined to serve the Saviour during life. The services that day were unusually impressive, and full of peace and joy in the Holy Spirit, such as had not been known to them before.

James returned home that evening happy. He felt that he had a place among the people of God. He could truly say,

"This is the way I long have sought,
And mourned because I found it not."

Here we take leave of James and Jane feeling that we have not followed them through their religious struggles without profit. Their integrity has been somewhat above the average, but the conclusions to which they have come may and will be reached by every one, learned or unlearned, who will carefully and conscientiously investigate God's word to ascertain what God has required of us.

We feel a pain at parting with such genuine humanity, but we realize that the best of friends in this world must part. But we are looking for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God; to a heavenly and an enduring substance.

Reader, a word to you. Have you enlisted in the service of Christ? If not, see to it at once that you make peace with God. I may never have met you in life, and may never meet you on this side of the cold stream of death, but in the presence of the Judge of the whole earth you and I must stand, to receive the things done in the body, whether they be good or bad. And pledging to faithfulness until death, I bid you an affectionate

FAREWELL.



Date Due

BV		10815
4930	Dungan	
D916	On the rock; or truth	
1872	stranger than fiction	

BV		10815
4930		
D916		
1872		

Dungan

On the rock; or truth stranger
than fiction

